


THE BRITISH NATION

PRICE \$1.00

WRONG



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2009 with funding from
Ontario Council of University Libraries

The British Nation



MORANG'S MODERN TEXT-BOOKS

THE BRITISH NATION

A HISTORY

BY

GEORGE M. WRONG, M.A.

PROFESSOR OF HISTORY IN THE UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO

AUTHORIZED BY THE MINISTER OF EDUCATION FOR USE IN THE HIGH SCHOOLS AND
COLLEGIATE INSTITUTES OF ONTARIO

AUTHORIZED FOR USE IN MANITOBA AND BRITISH COLUMBIA

PRICE \$1.00

TORONTO

MORANG EDUCATIONAL COMPANY LIMITED

1907

Entered according to Act of the Parliament of Canada, in the year
Nineteen Hundred and Four, by MORANG & CO. LIMITED, at the
Department of Agriculture.

PREFACE

WHEN Mr. Green published, nearly thirty years ago, his *Short History of the English People*, he gained final victory for due attention to social life as one of the most important phases of a nation's history. Since Mr. Green's time almost every aspect of British social development has been made the subject of special monographs. The six volumes on *Social England*, edited by the late Mr. Traill, embody these researches and represent the joint efforts of a large number of writers to give to the world the salient features of this side of national life.

In another direction, too, has there been a marked development of historical inquiry. The point of view of the present-day historian must be entirely neutral, and this critical spirit has been accompanied by a special biographical interest that demands adequate information about prominent personages. As yet no other country has met this interest as it has been met in Britain by the great *Dictionary of National Biography*, edited by Sir Leslie Stephen and Mr. Sidney Lee, and the wealth of authentic information thus made accessible cannot be

neglected even in the smaller works dealing with British history.

A further side of Britain's development has, in recent years, been invested with new meaning. Captain Mahan's series of works dealing with sea power have helped to make the nation conscious of one of the chief causes of its surprising growth, and to prove that, instead of being divided, it is linked together by the sea. Britain represents many states, and the aspiration to unite the several parts into one effective whole has now become almost a national passion. While England, as pioneer in developing the dominant phase of modern political life—representative government—must always stand first in the history of Britain, other divisions are contributing important elements, and Mr. Green's phrase, the English People, hardly covers the whole range of the history of the British nation.

The aim of the present work is to perform what will seem to many the impossible task of covering within the compass of a handy volume the salient features of the history of the British nation as it now stands before the world, and on the basis of the fuller information which modern research has made accessible. Though political development has been kept to the front, about one third of the chapters are devoted to social life. By recognising the principle that the less important periods may be passed over lightly to leave room for fuller treatment of the great eras, the author has tried to avoid the dullness of mere annals. He has aimed especially to interpret the characters of those conspicuous in the narrative. In another direction he finds that almost unconsciously to

himself Captain Mahan's teaching in regard to the importance of sea power has pervaded his interpretation of the past.

The illustrations have been chosen with much care from a great variety of sources. Crude as is the artistic quality of those contemporary with the earlier events, yet as representing the age itself and as the product of its spirit, they have greater historical value than more finished productions of present-day skill would have in relation to the same era. The pictures are intended not merely to illustrate but also to supplement the information of the text. It is hoped, for instance, that a fairly good conception of the development of architectural styles in England may be derived from a discerning study of the pictures relating to architecture. The portraits are from authentic sources, and dates of birth and death are furnished wherever possible. These dates have a meaning of their own. It will be found that most of the leaders in earlier periods died in what we now consider the prime of life, while many if not most of those of modern times have lived to ripe old age.

The books most likely to be useful to the reader have been briefly noted at the end of each chapter, and those of obvious and in some cases of popular interest, though they are not always the most important dealing with the period, are marked with an asterisk. The date noted is that of the most recent edition. A brief but adequate bibliography of both original and secondary authorities for the whole range of British history will be found in Gardiner and Mullinger's *Introduction to English History* (1894); while Dr. Gross's *Sources and Literature*

of English History from the Earliest Times to about 1485 (1900) is exhaustive for the mediæval portion. Stubbs's Constitutional History of England, and Low and Pulling's Dictionary of English History are books to be kept always at hand, if possible, and the Dictionary of National Biography is an exhaustless mine.

CONTENTS

CHAPTER I

	PAGES
QUESTIONS OF GEOGRAPHY AND RACE	1-17

Britain's place in history, 1. Her independent development, 2. Physical features of Britain, 2. The influence of climate, 3. The distribution of mineral resources, 5. Race questions: the Palæolithic culture, 6. The Neolithic culture, 9. The Celtic culture and race, 11. The political effect of insularity, 12. The racial types in Britain, 13. The robust activity of the English type, 15. The growth of population, 16. Books for reference, 17.

CHAPTER II

(55 B. C. to about 577 A. D.—632 years)

THE ROMAN AND ENGLISH CONQUESTS	18-29
---	-------

The period in Europe, 18. The culture of the early Britons, 18. Their government and religion, 20. The Roman invasion, 20. Roman civilization in Britain, 23. Extension and decline of Roman influence, 25. The coming of the English conquerors, 26. The culture of the English conquerors, 28. The relations of the English and the Britons, 29. Books for reference, 29.

CHAPTER III

THE CONVERSION OF ENGLAND	30-37
-------------------------------------	-------

The period in Europe, 30. Pope Gregory the Great and the Roman mission, 30. The early British Church, 32. The planting of Christianity in Ireland, 33. The Scottish mission in conflict with the Roman, 34. The vigour of the English Church, 35. The later corruptions of the English Church, 36. Books for reference, 37.

CHAPTER IV

(577 to 1066—489 years)

FROM THE ENGLISH TO THE NORMAN CONQUEST	39-61
---	-------

The period in Europe, 39. The supremacy of Wessex and the Danish invasion, 39. The work of Alfred the Great, 41. The suc-

cessors of Alfred, 42. The reign of Ethelred and the Danish conquest, 44. The rule of the Danish kings, 44. The reign of Edward the Confessor and the growth of Norman influence, 46. The house of Godwin, 48. The succession of Harold as king, 49. Position of William, Duke of Normandy, 50. Harold's difficulties, 51. William's claims to the English throne, 52. The Norwegian attack on England, 53. Harold's overthrow of the Norwegians at Stamford Bridge, 55. William's invasion of England and victory at Hastings, 57. William becomes king of England, 59. Books for reference, 61.

CHAPTER V

PRE-NORMAN CIVILIZATION IN ENGLAND 62-74

The English village community, 62. The manor, 63. Conditions in the English villages, 64. Food of the English, 65. Festivities of the English, 66. Dress of the English, 67. Dwelling-houses and furniture, 68. Industry and amusements, 68. Education and literature, 69. The laws of the English, 70. The hundred and the hundred-moot, 71. The folkmoot and the kingship, 72. The witenagemot, 73. Lack of unity in early England, 74. Summary of dates, 74. Books for reference, 75.

CHAPTER VI

(1066 to 1189—123 years)

FROM THE BEGINNING OF FOREIGN RULE UNDER WILLIAM THE CONQUEROR TO THE REFORMING ERA OF HENRY II. . . 76-105

The period in Europe, 76.

THE REIGN OF WILLIAM I, 1066-1087.

The completion of the conquest, 77. The Norman supremacy, 78. The Church is conceded a separate legal system, 80. Domesday Book, 80. The great court at Salisbury, 81. The death of William the Conqueror, 82.

THE REIGN OF WILLIAM II, 1087-1100.

The character of William, 83. His oppressions, 84. Pillage of the Church, 85.

THE REIGN OF HENRY I, 1100-1135.

Henry's Charter of Liberties, 87. His struggle with the baronage, 87. Quarrel with the Church about investiture, 88. Character of Henry's rule, 88.

THE REIGN OF STEPHEN, 1135-1154.

Baronial independence, 90. Civil war and anarchy, 90.

THE REIGN OF HENRY II, 1154-1189.

Character and position of Henry, 92. His quarrel with Thomas à Becket, 95. The constitutions of Clarendon, 96. The murder of Becket, 98. Results of Becket's murder, 99. Henry's struggle with the baronage, 100. The conquest of Ireland, 102. The disasters and death of Henry II, 103. Summary of dates, 104. Books for reference, 105.

CHAPTER VII

(1189 to 1307—118 years)

	PAGES
THE STRUGGLE AGAINST ROYAL DESPOTISM AND THE RISE OF THE COMMONS AS A FACTOR IN GOVERNMENT . . .	106-131
The period in Europe, 106.	
THE REIGN OF RICHARD I, 1189-1199.	
The character of Richard, 107. His crusading zeal, 107. Political progress during his reign, 109.	
THE REIGN OF JOHN, 1199-1216.	
John's depraved character, 109. The loss of Normandy, 110. John's oppressions of the baronage, 111. His attack upon the Church, 112. John compelled to sign the Great Charter, 113. The terms of the Great Charter, 113.	
THE REIGN OF HENRY III, 1216-1272.	
Character of Henry III, 115. His concessions to the Church, 115. Foreign influences encouraged by him, 116. His bad government, 117. The opposition of Simon de Montfort, 118. Civil war, 119.	
THE REIGN OF EDWARD I, 1272-1307.	
The character of Edward, 120. His conquest of Wales, 122. He makes Balliol king of Scotland, 123. His reforms of the law, 123. His checks upon the Church, 124. His reform of land tenure, 125. The expulsion of the Jews, 126. The enfranchisement of the Commons, 127. Foreign affairs, 128. The conquest of Scotland, 128. The revolt of Scotland, 129. Edward's place in history, 130. Summary of dates, 130. Books for reference, 131.	

CHAPTER VIII

ENGLISH CIVILIZATION IN THE THIRTEENTH CENTURY . . .	132-169
--	---------

The important influence of the Church, 132. Life in the monasteries, 133. St. Francis of Assisi and the mendicant movement, 135. The principles of feudal tenure, 136. The principles of chivalry, 137. The manorial system, 138. The condition of the villeins, 140. The mediæval village, 141. Criminal justice and its defects, 143. The frequency of the death penalty, 145. The lawlessness of mediæval England, 145. The Tithing and the Frank-pledge, 146. The growth of the towns, 147. The guilds, 148. Trade matters, 149. The extent of travel, 151. The Norman architecture, 152. The beginnings of Gothic architecture, 153. The mediæval castle, 154. The manor-house, 159. Food, sanitation, etc., 160. Dress, 161. Arms and armour, 162. Amusements, 164. Manners, 164. The rise of the universities, 165. The beginning of the colleges, 166. University discipline and studies, 167. Language and literature, 168. Books for reference, 169.

CHAPTER IX

(1307 to 1399—92 years)

ENGLAND IN THE FOURTEENTH CENTURY . . .	170-200
The period in Europe, 170.	

THE REIGN OF EDWARD II, 1307-1327.

The position of the Commons, 171. The character of Edward II, 171. His favourite Gaveston, 171. English defeat by the Scots at Bannockburn, 172. Deposition and death of Edward II, 173.

THE REIGN OF EDWARD III, 1327-1377.

Edward's character, 174. Wars with Scotland and France, 175. Victory at Crécy, 177. The Black Death, 178. Victory at Poitiers and treaty of Bretigny, 179. Renewed war and English reverses, 181. Edward's domestic policy, 183. His restraints upon the Church, 184. The misrule of Edward's later years, 185.

THE REIGN OF RICHARD II, 1377-1399.

The discontent of the peasants, 187. The teaching of John Wycliffe, 189. The armed rising of the peasants, 190. The end of the revolt, 193. Richard's attempted despotism, 194. His unpopularity and overthrow, 196. Intellectual progress, 197. Summary of dates, 198. Books for reference, 199.

CHAPTER X

(1399 to 1509—110 years)

A CENTURY OF CIVIL AND FOREIGN WAR 201-241

The period in Europe, 201.

THE REIGN OF HENRY IV, 1399-1413.

Rule and character of Henry IV, 202. The revolt in Wales, 203. The supremacy of the Commons, 204.

THE REIGN OF HENRY V, 1413-1422.

Character of Henry V, 204. The persecution of the Lollards, 205. Henry's claim to the throne of France, 206. Victory of Agincourt and treaty of Troyes, 207.

THE REIGN OF HENRY VI, 1422-1461.

Child rule of Henry VI, 209. The war in France; Joan of Arc, 211. Factions in England, 213. Defeat of the English in France, 215. The beginning of the Wars of the Roses, 216. The nature of the civil war, 217. The battle of Wakefield and Lancastrian triumph, 219.

THE REIGN OF EDWARD IV, 1461-1483.

Edward IV's victory at Towton, 220. Warwick the "kingmaker," 221. Quarrel of Edward IV and Warwick, 222. Overthrow of Edward by Warwick, 224. Final victories of Edward IV at Barnet and Tewkesbury, 225. The rule of Edward IV, 227.

THE REIGN OF EDWARD V, 1483.

The succession of the child Edward V, 228. The usurpation of Richard, Duke of Gloucester, 228.

THE REIGN OF RICHARD III, 1483-1485.

Unpopularity of Richard III, 231. The Earl of Richmond attacks and overthrows him, 232.

THE REIGN OF HENRY VII, 1483-1509.

The character of Henry VII, 233. Revolts against his rule, 234. His restraints upon the baronage, 236. The revived royal despot-

ism, 237. Henry's domestic and foreign policy, 238. The art of printing and the discovery of America, 239. Summary of dates, 240. Books for reference, 241.

CHAPTER XI

SOCIETY IN ENGLAND AT THE CLOSE OF THE MEDIEVAL

PERIOD 242-265

The independent power of the nobles, 242. The decline of the manorial system, 243. The spirit of violence in all classes, 243. Henry VII's enforcement of order, 246. The weakness of Parliament, 246. The decline of the monasteries, 247. The condition of rural England, 249. Means of communication, 250. The growth of the towns, 251. The guilds, 253. The government of the towns, 255. The increase of wealth, 256. The architecture of the period, 257. The art, etc., of the period, 258. Amusements, travel, food, manners, 260. Marks of progress and decline, 263. Literature and language, 264. Books for reference, 265.

CHAPTER XII

(1509 to 1603—94 years)

THE SIXTEENTH CENTURY IN ENGLAND 266-323

The period in Europe, 266.

THE REIGN OF HENRY VIII, 1509-1547.

Character of Henry VIII, 267. The career of Cardinal Wolsey, 268. Wolsey's foreign policy, 269. Wolsey's attack on the monasteries, 271. The marriage question and the fall of Wolsey, 272. Henry VIII's despotic rule, 274. The bloodshed accompanying the breach with Rome, 275. The condition of the monasteries, 278. The career of Thomas Cromwell, 279. The dissolution of the monasteries, 281. The revolt against the policy of dissolution, 282. Henry's Church policy of Roman doctrine without papal supremacy, 284. Henry's marriages, 285. His statesmanship, 286. His financial policy, 288. The question of the succession, 288.

THE REIGN OF EDWARD VI, 1547-1553.

The reversal of Henry's Church policy, 289. The desolation of the parish churches, 291. The sway of Northumberland and the death of Edward VI, 292.

THE REIGN OF MARY I, 1553-1558.

The overthrow of Lady Jane Grey, 295. Revolts against Mary's Spanish marriage, 295. The reconciliation with Rome and persecution of the Protestants, 296. Failure of Mary's policy, 298.

THE REIGN OF ELIZABETH I, 1558-1603.

The character of Elizabeth, 299. The Protestant settlement of Elizabeth, 300. Elizabeth's dangers, 302. Plots in favour of Mary Stuart, 304. England's final breach with Rome, 305. Elizabeth's defiance of Spain, 307. Execution of Mary Stuart, 308. The Spanish Armada and its defeat, 311. Persecution of Protestant non-conformity, 315. The Elizabethan seamen, 318. Parliament under Elizabeth, 319. The revolts in Ireland, 320. Death of Elizabeth, 321. Summary of dates, 322. Books for reference, 323.

CHAPTER XIII

PAGES

THE ENGLAND OF ELIZABETH 324-335

The strong government of the Tudors, 324. The literary activity of the age, 324. English mercantile enterprise, 326. The beginnings of colonial expansion, 326. Agriculture and the labouring classes, 328. Art, architecture, etc., 329. Manners and morals of the age, 332. Dress, 333. Food, weapons, amusements, 334.

CHAPTER XIV

(1603 to 1649—46 years)

THE STUART MONARCHY TO THE EXECUTION OF CHARLES I. 336-378

The period in Europe, 336.

THE REIGN OF JAMES I, 1603-1625.

The relations between Scotland and England, 337. The Stuart monarchy in Scotland, 338. Religious troubles in Scotland, 338. Scotland under James VI, 339. The position and character of James, 340. The Hampton Court Conference, 341. The persecution of Roman Catholics, 343. The Gunpowder Plot, 343. James's financial difficulties, 346. The monopoly evil and the fall of Bacon, 347. James's foreign policy, 349. War with Spain, 350. Colonization and literature, 351.

THE REIGN OF CHARLES I, 1625-1649.

The character of Charles I, 351. His quarrel with Parliament, 352. The Parliament's attack on Buckingham, 354. Suspension of life of Parliament for eleven years, 356. The tyranny of Laud, 357. Charles's means of raising revenue, 358. The career of Strafford: his work in Ireland, 359. The revolt in Scotland, 360. The summoning of Parliament in 1640, 362. The meeting of the Long Parliament and the execution of Strafford, 363. The Grand Remonstrance, 365. The outbreak of civil war, 366. The course of the civil war, 367. The victory of the New Model Army, 369. The disputes of Presbyterians and Independents, 371. The army seizes supreme power, 371. Failure of negotiations with Charles, 373. The renewed outbreak of war, 374. Trial and execution of Charles I, 375. Summary of dates, 377. Books for reference, 378.

CHAPTER XV

(1649 to 1660—11 years)

THE COMMONWEALTH AND THE PROTECTORATE 379-404

The period in Europe, 379. England becomes a republic, 379. Cromwell in Ireland, 380. The Protestant settlement in Ireland, 382. Cromwell in Scotland, 383. The conquest of Scotland, 385. War with Holland, 386. The decline of the Long Parliament, 387. The expulsion of the Long Parliament, 388. The Nominated Parliament, 389. Cromwell becomes Protector, 390. The character of Cromwell, 391. Cromwell's difficulties, 392. Cromwell becomes a second time Protector, 393. His last quarrel with Parliament, 394. The Dutch War, 395. The seizure of Jamaica, 395.

Cromwell's foreign policy, 396. Cromwell's colonial policy, 397. Cromwell's religious policy, 398. The death of Cromwell, 400. The succession and deposition of Richard Cromwell, 401. General Monk and the restoration, 402. Summary of dates, 404. Books for reference, 404.

CHAPTER XVI

(1660 to 1689—29 years)

THE RESTORATION AND THE REVOLUTION 405-426

The period in Europe, 405.

THE REIGN OF CHARLES II, 1660-1685.

Vengeance of the restored monarchy, 405. Insistence upon church uniformity, 407. Persecution of non-conformity, 409. The cause of the ruined cavaliers, 410. Charles II's attempts at arbitrary rule, 410. War with Holland, plague and fire, 411. The fall of Clarendon, 413. Charles's subservience to France, 413. The persecution of Roman Catholics, 415. The struggle between Charles and Parliament, 416. The "Tory" reaction and the "Rye House" plot, 417.

THE REIGN OF JAMES II, 1685-1688.

The policy of James II, 419. Monmouth's rebellion, 420. James's attempts to re-establish Roman Catholicism, 420. His Declaration of Indulgence and the trial of the seven bishops, 422. The coming of William of Orange, 424. Summary of dates, 425. Books for reference, 426.

CHAPTER XVII

(1689 to 1763—74 years)

FROM THE ENGLISH REVOLUTION TO THE CLOSE OF THE SEVEN YEARS' WAR 427-456

The period in Europe, 427.

THE REIGN OF WILLIAM III AND MARY, 1689-1702; MARY TO 1694 ONLY.

The religious struggle in Scotland, 428. The course of the revolution in Scotland, 430. The course of the revolution in Ireland, 431. Final defeat of James II's cause, 432. William III's character and religious policy, 432. Party government under William, 434. Finance under William, 434. William's dispute with Parliament, 435. His later years, 436.

THE REIGN OF ANNE, 1702-1714.

The character of Anne's rule, 436. Renewed war and the career of Marlborough, 437. The union with Scotland, 438. The overthrow of the Whigs and fall of Marlborough, 440. Intrigues for the Stuart pretender, 441.

THE REIGN OF GEORGE I, 1714-1727.

The Hanoverian succession, 442. The Jacobite rising of 1715, 443. The South Sea Bubble, 444. Walpole's supremacy, 445.

THE REIGN OF GEORGE II, 1727-1760.

The King and Caroline of Anspach, 446. Walpole's policy of peace, 447. The extent of corruption under Walpole, 448. The fall of Walpole, 449. The outbreak of war and the Jacobite rising of 1745, 450. The Seven Years' War, 451. The career of William Pitt, 452. The British conquests, 453.

THE REIGN OF GEORGE III, 1760-1820.

The succession of George III and fall of Pitt, 453. The Peace of Paris, 1763, 454. Summary of dates, 455. Books for reference, 456.

CHAPTER XVIII

(1763 to 1789—26 years)

THE ERA OF THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION 457-474

THE REIGN OF GEORGE III, 1760-1820.

Aims of George and changes of ministry, 457. Character of George's rule, 458. The case of Wilkes and the birth of radicalism, 460. The Gordon riots, 462. The taxation of the American colonies, 463. Opposition in America and repeal of the Stamp Act, 465. Townshend's tax on tea, etc., 466. Further causes of dispute, 467. The "Boston Tea Party," 468. The resolution to coerce the colonies, 469. The outbreak of hostilities and defeat of Britain, 470. The effect of the struggle upon Britain, 472. Summary of dates, 473. Books for reference, 474.

CHAPTER XIX

SOCIETY IN ENGLAND IN THE EIGHTEENTH CENTURY . . . 475-496

The great changes of the era, 475. The building of roads and canals, 475. Village agriculture, 477. The village community, 478. The new agriculture, 479. The industrial revolution, 479. The state of criminal law, 481. The condition of the prisons, 483. The lawlessness of England, 485. Gambling and drinking habits, 486. Indifference of the age to human life, 487. The state of religion and the work of Wesley, 487. Literature in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, 489. Art, 492. Education and the professions, 492. Food, dress, etc., 494. Constructive forces of the age, 495. Books for reference, 496.

CHAPTER XX

(1789-1815—26 years)

THE ERA OF THE FRENCH REVOLUTION 497-511

The period in Europe, 497.

THE REIGN OF GEORGE III, 1760-1820.

The supremacy and character of the younger Pitt, 498. War with revolutionary France, 499. The course of the French war; Nelson's victory at Trafalgar, 501. Napoleon's success in Europe and

the death of Pitt, 503. Britain and Napoleon's "Continental system," 503. The successors of Pitt, 504. The Peninsular war and the fall of Napoleon, 505. Britain's war with the United States, 506. The Hundred Days and Waterloo, 506. The condition of Ireland, 507. Grattan's Parliament and the Irish union, 508. Summary of dates, 510. Books for reference, 511.

CHAPTER XXI

(1815-1903—88 years.)

THE MODERN ERA 512-547

The period in Europe, 512.

THE REIGN OF GEORGE III, 1760-1820

Distress after the war, 513. The agitation for reform, 514.

THE REIGN OF GEORGE IV, 1820-1830.

Succession of George IV, 515. The decline of Toryism, 516. Relieving the Catholics from disabilities, 517.

THE REIGN OF WILLIAM IV, 1830-1837.

Renewed demand for reform, 518. The reform bill of 1832, 518. The abolition of slavery, 520. The factory act, 521. Poor law amendment, 521. Death of William IV, 522.

THE REIGN OF VICTORIA, 1837-1901.

The character of Victoria and the declining authority of the crown, 523. Peel and the corn laws, 525. The completion of free trade, 527. Lord John Russell and Lord Palmerston, 528. The Chartists, 529. Minor wars to 1854, 530. The causes of the Russian war, 531. The course of the Crimean war, 533. The Indian mutiny, 534. Later minor wars and dangers of war, 535. The second reform bill, 1867, 537. Gladstone and Disraeli, 538. The third reform bill, 1884, 539. The home rule problem, 540. The results of the Irish famine, 541. The disestablishment of the Irish Church, 542. The land question in Ireland, 542. Mr. Gladstone and home rule, 543. The Conservatives and the Irish question, 544. The death of Victoria and accession of Edward VII, 545. The Boer war, 546. Books for reference, 547.

CHAPTER XXII

SOCIAL CHANGES IN THE NINETEENTH CENTURY . . . 548-564

Improved means of communication; railways, etc., 548. The newspapers and the telegraph, 548. Penny postage, 550. The introduction of police and the softening of the criminal law, 551. "Tractarianism" and Church reform, 552. Secession from the Church of Scotland, 554. Electoral, civil service, and other reforms, 555. The growth of scientific knowledge, 556. Improvements in the professions, 557. Advances in education, 558. Art and literature, 560. Improvements in social conditions and manners, 561. The decline of the village, 563. Summary of dates, 563. Books for reference, 564.

CHAPTER XXIII

	PAGES
THE GROWTH OF THE BRITISH DOMINIONS	565-585

The different classes of British territory, 565. The acquisition of Canada, 566. The growth of constitutional liberty in Canada, 566. The formation of the Dominion of Canada, 568. The Canadian type of federal government, 568. The founding of Australia, 569. The growth of settlement, 571. The progress of Australia, 572. The federal commonwealth of Australia, 573. The British in South Africa, 574. The conflict with the Dutch in South Africa, 575. The European invasion of India, 576. Britain's struggle for supremacy in India, 577. Final winning of British supremacy in India, 578. The growth of British dominion in India, 579. The era of Warren Hastings, 580. Present-day problems in India, 581. Britain's influence in India, 582. The colonial situation at the present time, 583. The population of the British Empire, 583. Summary of dates, 584. Books for reference, 585.

LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS

(When a work has once been cited the name of the author or editor
alone is mentioned in later citations. N. P. G. stands for
the National Portrait Gallery in London.)

	PAGE
1. Palæolithic Flint Implement, found at Redhill, Thetford. (Evans, <i>Ancient Stone Implements of Great Britain</i>)	8
2. The Highest Example of Palæolithic Art. Reindeer incised on Antler. (Boyd Dawkins, <i>Early Man in Britain</i> , from Hein)	8
3. Neolithic Hatchet with Handle. (Evans)	9
4. Neolithic Hatchet with Handle. (Keller, <i>Lake Dwellings</i>)	9
5. Neolithic Axe. (Evans)	9
6. Long Barrow (restored). (Windle, <i>Life in Early Britain</i>)	10
7. Round Barrow. (<i>Archæologia</i> , xliii)	10
8. Section of Round Barrow showing Skeleton. (The same)	10
9. "John Bull." From Punch	14
10. Conjectural British War Chariot. (De Louthembourg).	19
11. Britons, showing Native Costume. (Racinet, <i>Le Costume Historique</i>)	19
12. Roman Sea-going Galley. After Basius. (Clowes, <i>Royal Navy</i>)	20
13. Julius Cæsar. From a bust in the Louvre. (Allen and Hudson, <i>Cæsar's Gallic War</i>)	21
14. Claudius. From a copper coin in the British Museum. (Craik and others, <i>Pictorial History of England</i> , published by Knight)	21
15. Roman Soldier. (Racinet)	22
16. Coin of Hadrian. (Smith's <i>Dictionary of Greek and Roman Biography</i>)	22
17. Part of the Roman Wall at the Present Day. From a photo- graph	23
18. Bishop about Tenth Century. From a contemporary minia- ture	32
19. Viking Boat found at Nydam in Schleswig. (Essenwein)	40

20. Soldier, Ninth Century. From a contemporary ms. (Green, English People)	41
21. Coin of Edgar. (Green)	44
22. King Canute. Redrawn from a contemporary ms. (Parmentier, Album Historique)	45
23. Emma, Wife of Canute. From the same	46
24. Wooden Church, built about 1013. (Vetusta Monumenta)	47
25. The Castle of Falaise. From an old print	50
26. English Axeman, 1066. From the Bayeux Tapestry	54
27. English Horseman. From an eleventh century ms. (Wright, Homes of Other Days)	54
28. English Spearmen. From an eleventh century ms. (Hewitt, Ancient Arms and Armour)	55
29. Norman War Vessel, Eleventh Century. Restoration by Jnl. (Clowes)	56
30. William the Conqueror on the Way to England. From the Bayeux Tapestry	57
31. Norman Archer, 1066. From the same	58
32. Battle of Hastings. From the same	58
33. Norman Horseman, 1066. From the same	59
34. Norman Knight, 1066. Redrawn from the Bayeux Tapestry. (Parmentier)	59
35. Battle Abbey. From a photograph	60
36. Carts, Eleventh Century. From a contemporary ms. (Green)	62
37. Ploughing, Eleventh Century. From a contemporary ms. (Green).	63
38. Agriculture, Eleventh Century. From a contemporary ms. (Green).	64
39. Workman, Eleventh Century. From a contemporary painting. (Parmentier)	65
40. Drinking and Music. From a contemporary ms. (Wright)	66
41. Gentleman and Lady, Tenth Century. From an eleventh century ms. (Wright)	67
42. Scourging a Slave. From an eleventh century ms. (Craik)	71
43. Old English Gallows. From an eleventh century ms. (Wright)	72
44. The Tower of London as it appeared in 1760. From an old print	79
45. William the Conqueror. From his great seal. (Hewitt)	82
46. Robert, Duke of Normandy. From his tomb in Gloucester Cathedral	88
47. Stephen. From a silver coin of his reign. (Craik)	90

	PAGE
48. Porchester Castle. (Hewitt)	91
49. Henry II. From his tomb at Fontevrault	93
50. Thomas à Becket. From his great seal. (Hewitt)	95
51. Henry II banishing Becket's Relatives. From a contemporary ms. (Craik)	98
52. Murder of Becket. From an ancient painting at Canterbury. (Craik)	99
53. Scourging of Henry II at Becket's Tomb. From an ancient painting on glass. (Craik)	100
54. Richard I. From his great seal. (Hewitt)	107
55. Crusading Knight. After a ms. in the British Museum	108
56. King John. From his tomb at Worcester	110
57. Château Gaillard. After Turner. (Green)	111
58. William Marshall, Earl of Pembroke. From his tomb. (Richardson, Monumental Effigies in the Temple Church)	114
59. Simon de Montfort. From a window in Chartres Cathedral, c. 1231. (Green)	118
60. Edward I. From his great seal. (Hewitt)	121
61. Eleanor, Wife of Edward I. From her tomb in Westminster Abbey	129
62. Robert Bruce. From a portrait by Jamieson. (Mackintosh, Scotland)	130
63. Priests, Thirteenth Century. From a contemporary ms. (Parmentier)	132
64. Kirkstall Abbey as in 1190. From a conjectural restoration by J. W. Cannon. (Barnard, Companion to English History)	134
65. Cistercian Monk. Thirteenth Century. After Hollar. (Dugdale's Monasticon)	135
66. Friar, Thirteenth Century. From a contemporary ms. (Parmentier)	136
67. Arming a Knight. From a thirteenth century ms. (Lacroix, Military and Religious Life in the Middle Ages)	137
68. Knighthood conferred on the Field of Battle. From a thirteenth century ms. (Lacroix)	138
69. Getting in the Harvest. From a fourteenth century ms. (Green)	140
70. Judicial Duel. From a fifteenth century ms. (Lacroix)	144
71. "Ornaments of a Mediæval Landscape." From an old ms. (Wright)	145
72. A Town Street. From a fifteenth century ms. (Lacroix, Science and Literature in the Middle Ages)	148

73. Pilgrim, Thirteenth Century. From a contemporary ms. (Parmentier)	150
74. Part of Norman Nave, Durham Cathedral. (Scott, Mediaeval Architecture)	151
75. Norman Doorway, Ilfley. (Parker, Glossary of Gothic Architecture)	152
76. Early English Front, about 1220. (Parker)	153
76A. Early English Doorway, about 1250. (Parker)	154
77. Nave, Lichfield, Early Decorated Style. (Murray's Cathedral Handbook)	155
78. Choir, Ely, Decorated Style. (Fergusson, History of Architecture)	156
79. Decorated Window, Reading. (Parker)	156
80. Berkeley Castle, Square Norman Keep. From a photograph. (Barnard)	157
81. Nottingham Castle, Thirteenth Century. Conjectural restoration. (Mackenzie, Castles of England)	157
82. Acton Burnell Manor-House, Thirteenth Century. (Turner, History of Domestic Architecture in England)	158
83. Drawbridge. (Viollet-le-Duc, Military Architecture)	159
84. Conversation in the Chamber. From a fourteenth century ms. (Wright)	159
85. Riding Costume, Thirteenth Century. Restoration by Viollet-le-Duc. (Parmentier)	161
86. Trader, Thirteenth Century. Restoration by Viollet-le-Duc after a contemporary ms. (Parmentier)	161
87. Knight, Twelfth Century. From a restoration in the Musée d'Artillerie, Paris. (Parmentier)	162
88. Knight, End of Thirteenth Century. From the same	162
89. Archer with Long-bow and Sheaf of Arrows. From a restoration by Viollet-le-Duc	163
90. Cross-Bowman with Shield. From the same	163
91. Chapel, Merton College, Oxford. (Ingram, Memorials of Oxford)	165
92. Book-ease with Chained Books, Hereford Cathedral. (Clark, The Care of Books)	165
93. A Thirteenth Century Professor From a bas-relief at Paris. (Parmentier)	166
94. Edward III. From a painting at Windsor	175
95. Archers in Chain-mail. From a fourteenth century ms. (Hewitt)	177
96. Mounted Knights. From a fourteenth century ms. (Hewitt)	177
97. Cross-bowmen. From a fourteenth century ms. (Hewitt)	178

	PAGE
98. The Castle Defence before Artillery. From a thirteenth century ms. (Hewitt)	180
99. Cannon, Fifteenth Century. From a contemporary ms. (Parmentier)	180
100. Movable Breaching Tower. (Gross, Military Antiquities) .	181
101. Edward, the Black Prince. From his tomb at Canterbury	186
102. Richard II. From a contemporary painting. (Green) .	187
103. John Wycliffe. From an old painting. (Craik) . .	189
104. Peasants Threshing, about 1340. From a contemporary ms. (Green)	190
105. Peasant Women, about 1340. From the same	190
106. Peasants, Fourteenth Century. From a contemporary French ms. (Parmentier)	191
107. John Ball preaching to Armed Crowds. From a ms. of Froissart in British Museum. (Newbolt, Froissart in Britain)	192
108. The Death of Wat Tyler. From the same	192
109. The Funeral of Richard II. From the same	196
110. Pontefract Castle as it was before its Destruction in the Reign of Charles II. (Craik)	197
111. Geoffrey Chaucer. From a painting in the N. P. G. . .	198
112. Henry V. From a modern bust. (Smith, Roll Call of Westminster Abbey)	205
113. Dismounted French Knight, about 1415. (Boutell, Arms and Armour)	208
114. Henry VI. From a portrait in the N. P. G. by an unknown painter	209
115. Chapel of King's College, Cambridge. (Le Keux and Cooper, Memorials of Cambridge)	210
116. Joan of Arc. From a statue by the Princess Mary of Orleans. (Oliphant, Jeanne d'Arc)	211
117. Early Hand-gun. From a fifteenth century ms. (Hewitt)	216
118. Early Form of Hand-gun. From the same	216
119. Richard, Duke of York. From a statue formerly at Shrewsbury. (Green)	219
120. Richard Neville, Earl of Warwick. After the Rous Roll. (Oman, Warwick)	221
121. Earl Rivers presenting his Book to Edward IV. From a ms. at Lambeth. (Craik)	231
122. Henry VII. From a miniature. (Creighton, Queen Elizabeth)	233

	PAGE
123. Elizabeth of York, Queen of Henry VII. From a miniature. (Creighton)	235
124. Margaret, Queen of Scotland, Daughter of Henry VII. From a painting in the N. P. G.	239
125. Knight, Fifteenth Century. From a restoration in the Musée d'Artillerie, Paris. (Parmentier)	243
126. Mounted Knight, Fifteenth Century. From the same	244
127. Complete Suit of Plate Armour, Fifteenth Century. Suit of Charles the Bold. (Boutell).	245
128. Lady's Chariot, Fourteenth Century. From a contemporary ms. (Wright)	251
129. Pillage of Town, Fifteenth Century. From a fifteenth century ms. of Froissart in the National Library at Paris. (Parmentier)	252
130. Attack and Defence of Town, Fifteenth Century. From the same	253
131. Ocean Ship of the Fifteenth Century. (Schulz, Deutsches Leben im XIV. und XV. Jahrhundert)	254
132. Tattershall Castle, Fifteenth Century. (Turner)	255
133. Decorated Window, Castle Ashby. (Parker)	256
134. Hurstmonceaux, Sussex. Fortified mansion, fifteenth century. (Turner)	257
135. Perpendicular Window, St. Mary's Warwick, about 1390. (Rickman, Gothic Architecture)	258
136. Perpendicular Interior, Gloucester Cathedral, about 1355. (Murray)	259
137. Mediaeval Tapster. From a carved seat in the parish church at Ludlow, Shropshire. (Wright)	260
138. Table Service, Lady of Quality, Fifteenth Century. From a contemporary ms. (Lacroix, Manners, Customs, etc., during the Middle Ages)	262
139. Henry VIII as a Young Man. From a miniature. (Pollard, Henry VIII)	267
140. Thomas Wolsey, Cardinal. From a portrait in the N. P. G. by an unknown painter	268
141. The Emperor Charles V. (Stacke, Deutsche Geschichte)	270
142. Martin Luther. From a painting by Holbein at Rome	271
143. Catherine of Aragon. From a miniature. (Pollard)	272
144. Ruins of Fountains Abbey. From an engraving in Dugdale's Monasticon	273
145. Thomas Crammer, Archbishop of Canterbury. From a painting at Lambeth. (Craik).	275

	PAGE
146. The Three Priors of the Charter House drawn to the Scaffold. From a fresco in the Charter House at Florence. (Hendriks, The London Charter House)	276
147. The Hanging of Two Charter House Friars at York. From a painting at Granada. (Hendriks).	277
148. Sir Thomas More. From a painting by Holbein in the N. P. G.	278
149. John Fisher, Bishop of Rochester. (Stewart, Life of Bishop Fisher)	278
150. Thomas Cromwell, Earl of Essex. From a painting by Holbein	279
151. St. Edmund's Abbey before the Suppression. From a conjectural restoration by W. K. Hardy. (Jessopp, Studies by a Recluse)	283
152. The Burning Place at Smithfield. (Fox, Acts and Monuments)	284
153. Henry VIII in Later Life. From a painting in the Royal Collection, Kensington	287
154. Edward Seymour, Earl of Hertford and Duke of Somerset. From a painting in the Verney Collection. (Pollard)	290
155. Edward VI. From a painting at Kensington	293
156. Mary I. From a painting by Corvus in the N. P. G.	294
157. Philip II of Spain. (Whitcomb, A History of Modern Europe)	295
158. Henry Grey, Duke of Suffolk. From a painting by Corvus in the N. P. G.	296
159. Reginald Pole, Archbishop of Canterbury. From a painting by Titian	298
160. Elizabeth. From a painting in the N. P. G. by an unknown artist	299
161. Sir William Cecil, Lord Burghley. From a painting in the N. P. G. by an unknown artist	302
162. Mary Stuart. From an engraving in the N. P. G. of a drawing from life by Janet	303
163. The Duke of Alençon. From a drawing in the National Library at Paris. (Creighton)	306
164. William Allen, Cardinal. From an engraving. (Green)	306
165. Robert Dudley, Earl of Leicester. From a portrait at Hatfield House. (Creighton)	307
166. Fotheringay in 1718. From an old print. (Craik)	309
167. Execution of Mary Stuart. From an engraving in the National Library at Paris. (Skelton, Mary Stuart)	310

	PAGE
168. Holding up Mary's Head after Execution. From the same	310
169. An English Ship of War, 1588. After tapestries in the House of Lords. (Clowes)	311
170. An English Ship of Private Ownership, about 1588. (Barnard)	312
171. Charles Howard, Lord Howard of Effingham and Earl of Nottingham. (Laughton, From Howard to Nelson) .	313
172. Sir Francis Drake. From an old print. (Corbett, Sir Francis Drake)	319
173. Robert Devereux, Earl of Essex. From a miniature. (Creighton)	320
174. William Shakespeare. From an engraving by Droeshout in the N. P. G.	325
175. Emmanuel College, Cambridge. (Le Keux and Cooper) .	329
176. Fitzwilliam Museum, Cambridge. From the same . .	330
177. Haddon Hall at the Present Time. (Barnard) . . .	331
178. Portion of Haddon Hall. From a photograph. . . .	332
179. Sir Christopher Hatton. From the painting by Ketel. (Hill, History of English Dress)	333
180. Soldier with Caliver, Time of Elizabeth. From the Roll of the Funeral Procession of Sir Philip Sydney, 1586. (Hewitt)	334
181. Pikeman, Time of Elizabeth. From the same . . .	335
182. John Knox. From a picture in the collection of Lord Somerville. (Craik)	339
183. James I. (Eggleston, History of the United States) . .	341
184. The Gunpowder Plotters. From an engraving from life by Crispin van der Passe in the N. P. G.	344
185. The Vault beneath the House of Lords, associated with the Gunpowder Plot. From an old print. (Craik) . . .	345
186. George Villiers, Duke of Buckingham. From the paint- ing by Jansen. (Lodge, Portraits of Illustrious Per- sonages)	347
187. Francis Bacon, Baron Verulam. From the painting by Paul van Somer in the N. P. G.	349
188. Sir Walter Raleigh. From the painting by Zuccherò. (Lodge)	350
189. Charles I. From a painting by Van Dyck	352
190. Henrietta Maria, Queen of Charles I. From a painting by Van Dyck. (Morley, Oliver Cromwell)	353
191. Sir John Eliot. From a painting at Port Eliot. (Forster, Sir John Eliot)	353

	PAGE
192. Cardinal Richelieu. From an engraving by Charles Knight, London	355
193. William Laud, Archbishop of Canterbury. From a copy in the N. P. G. of a portrait by Van Dyck	357
194. Thomas Wentworth, Earl of Strafford. From a miniature. (Skelton, Charles I)	359
195. John Hampden. From a portrait in possession of the Earl of St. Germain's. (Nugent, Memorials of Hamp- den)	362
196. John Pym. From a miniature. (Nugent)	362
197. The Execution of Strafford at the Tower, 1641. From a print by Hollar. (Skelton)	364
198. "Roundhead," about 1649. From an old engraving. (Falke, Costümgeschichte)	366
199. Prince Rupert. From a painting by Van Dyck. (Gardi- ner, Oliver Cromwell)	368
200. Alexander Leslie, Earl of Leven. From a painting at Melville House. (Terry, Life of Alexander Leslie)	370
201. Cornet George Joyce. From a painting at Chequers Court, Buckinghamshire. (Gardiner)	372
202. Henry Ireton. From a painting by R. Walker. (Gar- diner)	374
203. The House of Commons, 1648. From an old print. (Skel- ton)	376
204. The Execution of Charles I. From a painting in possession of the Earl of Rosebery. (Skelton)	377
205. James Butler, Duke of Ormonde. From the painting by Kneller. (Lodge)	381
206. The Scots holding their Young King's Nose to the Grind- stone. From a broadside in the British Museum. (Green)	384
207. Archibald Campbell, Eighth Earl and First Marquis of Argyle. From a painting in possession of the Marquis of Lothian. (Gardiner)	385
208. Cardinal Mazarin. From an engraving by G. Staal, Paris	386
209. Oliver Cromwell. From a painting by Cooper. (Gardiner)	391
210. Puritans destroying the Cross at Cheapside. From a con- temporary print in the British Museum. (Craik)	399
211. Richard Cromwell. From a painting by Walker. (Gar- diner)	401
212. George Monk, Duke of Albemarle. From a miniature. (Gardiner)	403

	PAGE
213. Sir Henry Vane. From the portrait by Lely. (Hosmer, Young Sir Henry Vane)	406
214. Edward Hyde, Earl of Clarendon. From the portrait by Lely. (Lodge)	407
215. Charles II. From an engraving by Freeman, after a painting by Sir Peter Lely	410
216. The Great Fire of London. From a painting by Verschuur at Budapest. (Airy, Charles II)	412
217. Fleeing from the Plague. From a broadside relating to an outbreak of plague in 1630. (Green)	413
218. Louis XIV. From a contemporary miniature. (Airy, Charles II)	414
219. Anthony Ashley Cooper, First Earl of Shaftesbury. From a painting by Lely. (Green)	414
220. William Howard, Viscount Stafford. From a painting by Van Dyck. (Evelyn's Diary)	416
221. James Scott, Duke of Monmouth. From an old print	417
222. The Rye House. (Craik)	418
223. William, Lord Russell. From a painting by Lely. (Lodge)	419
224. George, Baron Jeffreys. From a portrait by Kneller in the N. P. G.	420
225. James II. From a painting by Lely. (Diary of Samuel Pepys, edited by Wheatley)	421
226. William Penn. From a portrait in possession of the Historical Society of Pennsylvania. (Houghton, William Penn).	422
227. The Seven Bishops going to the Tower. From a Dutch print of 1689. (Green)	423
228. Embarkation of William of Orange at Helvoetsluys. (Craik)	424
229. Banner carried into Battle in 1679 by some of the More Extreme Covenanters. (The Bluidie Banner used at Drummellog and Bothwell Brig.) (Napier, Life of Graham of Claverhouse)	429
230. John Graham of Claverhouse, Viscount Dundee. From a painting by Lely. (Lodge)	430
231. John Churchill, Duke of Marlborough. (Bucke, Life of the Duke of Marlborough)	438
232. Henry St. John, Viscount Bolingbroke. From an engraving by Zumpe	442
233. Sir Robert Walpole, Earl of Orford. From a painting by Vanloo in the N. P. G.	445

234. Caroline of Anspach, Queen of George II, as Princess of Wales. (Tytler, <i>Six Royal Ladies of the House of Hanover</i>)	447
235. William Augustus, Duke of Cumberland. From a painting by Gainsborough. (<i>The Anglo-Saxon Review</i>)	451
236. William Pitt, Earl of Chatham. From a print by E. Fisher after a painting by R. Brompton	452
237. James Wolfe. From a painting by Schaak in the N. P. G.	453
238. Frederick the Great. (Stacke, <i>Deutsche Geschichte</i>)	454
239. George III. From a painting by Lawrence	459
240. An Intimidating Poster against obeying the Stamp Act. (Lamb's <i>History of New York</i>)	464
241. Andrew Oliver. (Appletons' <i>Cyclopædia of American Biography</i>)	465
242. Benjamin Franklin. After the painting in the N. P. G. by Baricolo from a painting by Duplessis	468
243. Thomas Hutchinson. From a painting by Copley	468
244. "Unite or Die." From a contemporary cartoon	469
245. George Washington. From a painting by Trumbull	470
246. Independence Hall, Philadelphia. From a contemporary drawing	471
247. Medallion made at Paris in Honour of Benjamin Franklin. From the original by Nini in the N. P. G.	472
248. James Brindley. From a painting by Parsons	476
249. Jonathan Wild pelted by the Mob on his Way to Execution. From the <i>Tyburn Chronicle</i>	482
250. A Man whipped at the Cart's Tail for Petty Larceny. From the same	483
251. The Sleeping Congregation. After Hogarth	488
252. John Wesley. (Appletons' <i>Cyclopædia of American Biography</i>)	489
253. John Milton. From an engraving by Faithorne in the N. P. G.	490
254. John Dryden. From an old print	490
255. Alexander Pope. From a bust by Roubillac. (<i>Elwin and Courthorpe, Pope's Works</i>)	491
256. Gentleman's Costume, Beginning of Eighteenth Century. Portrait of John Law. (Hill, <i>History of English Dress</i>)	494
257. William Pitt. From a painting by J. Hoppner	498
258. Charles James Fox. (<i>Lodge</i>)	499
259. Edmund Burke. From the painting by Reynolds	500

	PAGE
260. Horatio, Viscount Nelson. From the painting by Abbott in the N. P. G.	501
261. Napoleon Bonaparte. From a drawing by Denon. (Anglo- Saxon Review)	502
262. Arthur Wellesley, Duke of Wellington. (Alexander, Life of the Duke of Wellington)	505
263. Henry Grattan. From an engraving by J. Godby from a drawing by A. Pope	508
264. Robert Stewart, Viscount Castlereagh and Marquis of Lon- donderry. From a painting by Lawrence. (Anglo- Saxon Review)	509
265. The Union Flag. (Green)	510
266. George IV. From a painting by Lawrence in the N. P. G.	515
267. Charles, Earl Grey. From a painting by Lawrence in the N. P. G.	520
268. William Wilberforce. (Wilberforce Papers)	520
269. William Lamb, Viscount Melbourne. From a painting by Lawrence	522
270. Victoria. From a photograph	524
271. Sir Robert Peel. From a bust by Noble in the N. P. G.	526
272. Lord John, afterward Earl, Russell. From a painting by Grant in the N. P. G.	527
273. Henry John Temple, Viscount Palmerston. From a bust by Brown. (Ashley, Viscount Palmerston)	529
274. Napoleon III. From an engraving by Le Francq, Paris	532
275. Benjamin Disraeli, Earl of Beaconsfield. From a painting by Grant. (Froude, Lord Beaconsfield)	537
276. William Ewart Gladstone. From a photograph	539
277. Charles Stewart Parnell. From a photograph	543
278. Edward VII. From a photograph	546
279. The First Railway Coach. Coach drawn by a horse. (Smiles, Life of Stephenson)	549
280. John Henry Newman, Cardinal. (Fitzgerald, Fifty Years of Catholic Life and Progress)	553
281. John George Lambton, Earl of Durham. From a painting by Lawrence in the N. P. G.	567
282. Sir John Alexander Macdonald. From a photograph	569
283. Captain James Cook. After a portrait by Dance	570
284. Robert, Lord Clive. From a painting at Government House, Calcutta.	579
285. Warren Hastings. From a painting by Reynolds in the N. P. G.	580

GENEALOGICAL TABLES

	PAGE
1. The English Kings from Egbert to Edward the Confessor	38
2. The Norman Kings of England	76
3. The Angevin or Plantagenet Kings of England	105
4. Edward III's Claim to the Throne of France	176
5. Genealogy of the Houses of Lancaster and York	200
6. The House of Stuart	336
7. The Genealogies of the Houses of Orange and Hanover	426

FULL-PAGE MAPS

1. The British Isles	<i>(inside cover at the beginning)</i>	
2. Alfred's England	<i>to face page</i>	41
3. Monasteries of England and Wales in the Time of Henry VIII		280
4. South Africa	<i>to face page</i>	575
5. India	<i>to face page</i>	578
6. The British Empire	<i>(inside cover at end)</i>	

MAPS AND PLANS IN THE TEXT

1. The Land Hemisphere, showing the Central Position of Britain. (Mackinder, Britain and the British Seas)	2
2. The Average Annual Rainfall of Britain. (Mackinder)	4
3. British Coal Fields. (Adams, Commercial Geography)	6
4. The Distribution of Population in England in 1700, prior to the Development of manufacturing Industry. (Mackinder)	7
5. The Same in 1901 after the Development of Industry. (Mackinder)	7
6. The Relative Darkness of the British Population. (Mackinder)	11
(The shading is based upon the principle that each head of dark hair is counted once, each head of black hair twice, and each head of light hair negatively once.)	
7. Bird's-Eye View of Roman Plan of a Town. (Viollet-le-Duc, Military Architecture)	24
8. Roman Britain, about 400 A. D.	25
9. Britain in 597	31

	PAGE
10. Military Centres of Britain, showing March of William the Conqueror. (Mackinder)	61
(The map illustrates not only the march of William, but also the fact that the British bases of naval action—Chatham, Sheerness, Portsmouth, and Devonport—stand facing France and the mouths of the Rhine as possible sources of danger. A new naval base is now being established on the northeast coast of Scotland to face Germany on the Baltic.)	
11. Dominions of Henry II	92
12. France at the Treaty of Bretigny, 1360	182
13. France at the Time of Joan of Arc, 1429	212
14. The Wars of the Roses	218
15. Catholic Population in Great Britain. (Réclus, Géographie Universelle)	315
16. England at the Beginning of the Civil War, 1643.	367
17. The Divisions of Australia	571

THE BRITISH NATION: A HISTORY

CHAPTER I

Questions of Geography and Race

THE British Isles include an area of only 120,839 square miles, and represent less than one four-hundred-and-thirtieth part of the habitable globe, yet The place of Britain in world history. they have exerted upon mankind perhaps a wider influence than has any other state.

Though Rome matured a majestic system of law and discipline, she did not find room for freedom, and, while she conquered, she did not, in any real sense, colonize. Britain has done what Rome failed to do: from her come our notions of constitutional liberty and representative government, and she has planted great daughter states and trained them in the same principles. Time has wrought vast physical changes in the islands. At one time continuous dry land united England and Ireland with each other and with the Continent, huge mammoths roamed in their forests, the hippopotamus and the rhinoceros wallowed in their rivers. The islands were always remote from the culture of the ancient world. Enveloped often in fog, with what southern peoples thought a harsh climate, and inhabited by fierce tribes, they had few attractions for the Greek and Roman, and did not become important until Christian civilization spread over northern Europe. Then Britain, no longer on the outskirts of the world, began to play a greater part in

human society. She was "insulated, yet not isolated," for from her island shores ships could go easily to widely separated parts of the adjacent continent. The discovery of America completed the change from a remote to a cen-



THE LAND HEMISPHERE, SHOWING THE CENTRAL POSITION OF BRITAIN.

tral position. Britain lay between Europe and America, and her growth in maritime power enabled her to reach easily the new as well as the old world. A study of her position on the map will show how natural it was that she should become the centre of world commerce.

Cut off by the sea from direct communication with the Continent of Europe, the islands have pursued their own course of development. Continental revolutions have but slightly affected them, only rarely has a foreign army landed on their shores, while they, on the other hand, have often been able to exert a moderating influence in Europe. The three political divisions—England, Ireland, and Scotland

Independent
development of
Britain.

—were until modern times separate kingdoms, often at strife with each other. They differ still in laws, customs, and religion, and no common name has yet been found for their inhabitants; perhaps neither “English” nor “British” includes the natives of the smaller island, but both terms are used interchangeably to designate the people of the United Kingdom.

The western shores of both islands are mountainous, and from that side they are not readily accessible. Eng-

Physical
features.


land’s natural outlook is towards Europe, for the majority of her rivers empty on the east coast, and there, too, is found her most fertile land. The soil of England is only slightly undulating until the mountains of Wales are reached. A large part of Scotland, on the other hand, is mountainous, while Ireland, except for the defenceless coast of Meath, easily reached from England, has a cordon of mountains surrounding the great boggy plain of the interior. It is not strange that England, with no natural barriers to hold back assailants, and richer in resources, should have seen foreign invasion when Ireland and Scotland escaped. Her misfortunes brought a compensation: she felt the stimulating influence of contact with other peoples far more than either of the other states.

“Father Ocean,” it has been said, “has a bias towards England.” The warm waters of the Gulf Stream sweep

The influence
of climate.

along her shores and make mild and equable latitudes that in America are arctic. The rivers of Britain are rarely ice-bound; the difference of average temperature between the warmest and the coldest months of the year is not more than 25°, and changes of the seasons interrupt but little the varied activities of the inhabitants. Winds are stronger and more rain falls in Britain than in adjacent continental countries. Though there is too much fog and too little

sunshine, the climate has proved friendly both to open-air life and to agriculture. King Charles II, who had dwelt in many lands, said that the best climate was that in which one could be abroad with pleasure, or at least without trouble and inconvenience, for the most days of the



THE AVERAGE ANNUAL RAINFALL OF BRITAIN.

year and the most hours of the day, and this condition he thought prevailed in England more than in any other country in Europe. The abundant rains help to fertilize the soil: an English landscape is usually rich in beautiful shade-trees, shrubs, and flowers. The climate has proved friendly to the most useful domestic animals. In the rearing and fattening of live stock some districts of Britain stand pre-eminent, and the British race-horse and the short-horned Durham cattle represent the finest types of their species. The rich pasturage favours especially

the rearing of sheep; British wool has for centuries been recognised as possessing superior excellence. On the other hand, Britain has too little sun to produce the finer fruits.

The geological formation of the islands is remarkable, for in them can be traced most of the great upheavals affecting Europe and many of the characteristic structures of Asia and America. Nature has not spread her favours equally. Ireland has been handicapped by more than a remote situation and an unhappy history. She has

The distribution
of mineral and
other wealth.
Ireland's
situation and
resources.

but slight mineral wealth; one-seventh of her surface is bog, and her more abundant rainfall, while resulting in peculiarly green verdure, robs the land of sunshine, and makes the seasons so late that wheat and oats are sometimes not harvested until October and November. Though she has great advantages as a grazing country, and rears nearly as many horned cattle as England, she has not equal resources for varied industrial life, and linen is the only great manufacture in which she leads. Scotland, too,

Scotland's
resources.

has spare natural endowments. The rugged Highlands of the north represent more than one-half her soil; they give but scanty reward to agriculture, and are not rich in minerals. In the south also are barren uplands, rising sometimes to the height of 3,000 feet, and between these highlands lie the central lowlands—only about one-sixth of Scotland, but so rich in soil and in mineral treasures as to be the most important part of the country. There coal and iron are found close together and great industries have sprung up, chief among them the ship-building of the Clyde. The ceaseless toil of an industrious race has made a garden of many parts of Scotland little favoured by nature, but her wealth has come not from this hardy agriculture, but from the growth of manufactures during the past century and a half.



England (including Wales) is the largest, most fertile, and the most varied in mineral wealth of the three divisions of the United Kingdom. Nearly every mineral of economic value is found within her borders. Among them coal stands first, and where, as at Newcastle, iron is found in close proximity to coal, and both are on the seacoast, and thus easily distributed, every advantage in manufacture is secured. The most

The resources
of England
and Wales.

fertile areas of England lie south of a line drawn from the mouth of the Ouse to the mouth of the Severn. Northwest of this line is found the mineral wealth which has made great districts of Lancashire, Yorkshire, and other counties teeming hives of industry. Though for long centuries England grew rich by agriculture, in modern times her minerals have made the fertility of the soil of secondary importance: she is now dependent upon other countries for four-fifths of her supply of wheat.



The earliest inhabitants of Britain of whom we have any trace were a rude people, short and dark—a race of



THE DISTRIBUTION OF POPULATION IN ENGLAND BEFORE
AND AFTER THE DEVELOPMENT OF MANUFACTURING INDUSTRY.

hunters, similar in type to the Eskimos of Greenland. The game of their time included the reindeer and the


Questions of
race: (1) The
Palæolithic
culture.

moose-ox, the elephant, the mammoth, and the lion.

These people lived in caves, and at first had wit to use only such implements as the clubs and stones which nature furnished ready made to their hands. They treated their dead as carrion, throwing the bodies out with other refuse. But they improved and in time made effective stone axes and spear- and arrow-heads; they showed, too, an artistic sense, for on the bones which lay about them in their cave-dwellings they scratched vigorous drawings, still preserved, of the mammoth, the horse, and the reindeer. We call their culture Palæolithic (old stone), because their stone implements represent the very oldest product of human inventiveness.



PALEOLITHIC FLINT IMPLEMENT.
The two edges are sharp.



THE HIGHEST EXAMPLE OF PALEOLITHIC ART.
Incised on an antler found in a cave.

Later a more advanced race came, apparently from the south or from the southeast, to dwell in the islands. They were not mere hunters, but herdsmen, and they had learned to grind their stone hatchets and arrow-heads into shapes some-

times beautiful. Probably they tilled the ground; by infinite labour they cut down with stone axes the forest trees; they used spindle and distaff to weave cloth, and had dogs, horses, pigs, goats, and oxen for domestic animals. They acquired, too, an elementary art of building; to this day remain the rudely constructed stone chambers, covered with

(2) The
Neolithic
culture.



NEOLITHIC HATCHET WITH HANDLE.

earth and sometimes a hundred feet long, in which they placed their dead. No metal tools were used in building these egg-shaped mounds. Even rude peoples make vessels of pottery in which to boil, carry, or store water and other fluids, but the long-barrow men had not yet advanced to this stage. They belong to the Neolithic (new



NEOLITHIC HATCHET
IMBEDDED IN HANDLE.

stone) age, because, though they still used only stone implements, these were of a newer and better fashion.

Neolithic culture extended in time over the whole of the two islands, and might have grown at length to something like civilization.



NEOLITHIC AXE.

But to interrupt its course came, it seems from a northerly region, a new host of invaders, much taller, with heads broader than the long, narrow ones

of their predecessors, and with a superior culture. These newcomers were no longer dependent upon stone implements, but used bronze, and even iron, and they had well-ornamented pottery in abundance. Instead of long barrows, they built circular or bell-shaped chambers for their dead, and often imposed these round barrows on the old long ones. They overran England and parts of Scot-

(3) The invasion of the long-barrow race and their culture.



LONG BARROW (RESTORED) WITH RING OF STANDING STONES.


land, but never reached Ireland, which thus missed the stimulating influence of a new culture, the first of many instances in which its remote situation has left it a little



ROUND BARROW.

behindhand in the movements affecting its neighbours. The new invaders in time lost their ascendancy. Apparently, they in-

termingled with and were absorbed by the original inhabitants of the island, though the type is still found among



SECTION OF ROUND BARROW SHOWING SKELETON.

the old yeomanry class in, for instance, the remote parts of Cumberland and in the Shetland Islands.

So far as we can learn these were the racial movements affecting Britain in prehistoric times. When written history begins with the Roman invasion the

These elements unite to form the Celtic culture and race.


country has already passed out of its primitive barbarism. Its people, ranked henceforth as a Celtic race like their neighbours in Gaul,

used iron implements, practised agriculture extensively, and traded with continental Europe. The Romans intermingled but little with the ancient population and added

The Teutonic invasions.

no new racial element, but the tall, fair-haired, blue-eyed barbarians known in history as Germans or Teutons, who succeeded the

Romans as conquerors, had a more lasting influence. They slowly drove back the earlier inhabitants into the



THE RELATIVE DARKNESS OF THE BRITISH POPULATION.

mountain regions of Wales, Devon, and Cornwall, and were finally masters of the richest parts of England and

Scotland. Later Teutons—Danes and Normans—followed these pioneers to Britain, and the racial situation thus created exists to this day. England and the southern part of Scotland are overwhelmingly Teutonic in character; the other regions, including Ireland, are still peopled mainly, it is probable, by the descendants of those who reared the long and the round barrows. It is a remarkable fact that the inhabitants of these districts are to this day darker than are those of the Teutonic areas. Britain has her best side towards Europe, and in the foreground is the Teuton; the Celt is in the background, cut off by his Teutonic neighbour from independent access to the European world.

The position of Britain, two islands cut off by the sea from direct contact with the rest of the world, has involved that the growth of sea power should become the dominant factor in her development. As commerce grew it was necessary for her to be so strong upon the sea that no other state could cut off communications and ruin her by isolation, and in time she built up the naval supremacy which it is now the cardinal doctrine of her statecraft to maintain. Insularity aided political liberty. An enemy could not readily throw invading forces across the sea, and her people, with no tramp of hostile armies in their ears, were freer to think of their own affairs, to contend for their own rights, than were those of any other European state. Succeeding generations have held what their predecessors gained. Free institutions have been deeply embedded in the nation's history, with the result that while no other European state is so free, few are so much swayed by precedent and tradition. Vestiges of the past are everywhere; the Norman French of six centuries ago is still used in parliamentary formulas; laws, agreements, leases, made many hundred, even a thousand years ago, have still binding force; no other great state has preserved

The political
influence of
geographical
situation.

such complete records of its history. So strong is the reverence for tradition that a defect of the English character is to estimate opinions not by their truth but by their association with what has secured recognition in the past, and to give rank and title a weight no longer conceded in other societies on the same free basis.

Race, like geographical conditions, has played a considerable part in the evolution of Britain. The invading Teuton and those whom he displaced had already, before their contact, matured fundamental variations which time and intercourse have not wholly removed, though they tend to disappear. The sea which brought the successive invaders cut off their return, and Celt and Teuton, in the same environment, and now with a much freer movement in population than was possible in earlier times, approach a common mean in physical attributes. They are no longer distinguishable in stature; there is now practically but one—the long and narrow—type of skull in the two islands. Modern commercial conditions in Celtic Ireland and Teutonic England tend also to produce the same type of social life, though the smaller island is still much the poorer. In political life, too, Ireland becomes steadily more like her neighbours. It is in religion that the most vital differences remain.

The ferocious Teuton of the sixth century has, in the course of the history which we now study, become the modern “John Bull,” the typical Englishman. He is ruddy, broad-shouldered, in every way solid, a plain man, well-to-do, fond of his own comfort and caring but little for intellectual things; but he is honest, resolute, and loyal, anxious to do his duty, and good-natured, though sometimes irritable and unreasonable. Such is the picture which the Englishman likes to draw of his own average self. The Scot

Differences of
race.

The English-
man, Scot, and
Irishman of the
present day.

in the rugged northern half of the island has carried on a sterner war with nature and has acquired in consequence the greater adaptability and alertness which make him a better colonist; he has, too, keener insight and acuter powers of thought, but he failed to produce so refined a culture as the English. The Irish people have never lost



"JOHN BULL."
From *Punch*.

the sad consciousness of conquest by the Teuton. The earlier history of the island differs strangely from the later. Even Rome did not conquer Ireland, which also suffered little from the Northmen who desolated England. Conquest came later, when in the twelfth century Ireland's backward culture gave the English aggressor his opportunity. Until the sixteenth century the clan system prevailed, and Ireland has always been too weak in political organization to throw off her assailant. Hospitable, gay, shrewd, and witty as are the Irish people, and in no sense inferior to their neighbours in physical and mental endow-

ments, the long tragedy of their history has yet left its trace in the national character. Irish society shows to this day the cleavage between the conquering and the conquered race. The flattery of the Irish peasant is but the survival of attempts on the part of a people in bondage to please a hard master, and the lack of a sense of order and of perseverance often apparent in the subject race is traceable to the absence of the self-discipline fostered by freedom. In no other country of Europe have poverty and famine wrought such havoc, and the peculiarly oppressive conditions caused by conquest have

directly contributed to this result. In modern times a large part of Ireland's population has left her for other shores.

The classes which have led in English life have never been dwellers in towns. Except for a few months in the London season, they still prefer the country and they relieve the stagnation of rural life by outdoor pastimes, delight in which has become a national characteristic. The climate, though mild, is severe enough to invite to action rather than to voluptuous ease. English youth play boisterous games, and the hardy pleasures of the hunting field have many devotees. M. Taine, an acute French critic, found that the men and women of England were more robust and had less sensitive nerves than those of France, and that even the horses were larger and stronger. An English artisan, the same writer thought, could work without fatigue longer than a Frenchman, and could in a day accomplish twice as much with his hands as his rival. Surgical operations in English hospitals are less frequently fatal than are those of the same class in France. The islanders, while lacking in the finer qualities of wit and artistic insight, are the more vigorous type, full of energy, and delighting in strong meat and drink. But the unwholesome conditions in the crowded manufacturing areas tend to weaken and stunt the artisans who form at the present time so large a part of the population.

The British, with their courageous and adventurous spirit, have been leaders in discovery all over the world.

No other European race travels so much. The average Englishman uses the railway seven times as often as does the Frenchman, and from pure love of action he explores the mountain tops of Europe and Asia. He is eager for facts and reality, but impatient of theory; and in political life the nation has fixed its attention upon the thing which

The robust type
of life developed
in England.

Active and
practical type
of the English
character.

seemed practicable at the time, and has shown no care for logical coherence. The type has the defects of its qualities. Strength of purpose makes the Englishman masterful and sometimes exacting, so that he is respected rather than loved by other nations. Dwelling upon an island, he is himself insular, self-contained, and often hard, cold, and unsympathetic. His demeanour is grave; in contrast with the Frenchman and the Italian, no animated gesture accompanies his speech, which is low in tone, laconic, and direct. Strong affections and deep beliefs often lie beneath this impassive surface. Christian faith and hope have played, and still play, a large part in the nation's life, and the Englishman's instinct for the practical makes him emphasize the moral duties involved in faith.

At the Norman Conquest England appears to have contained rather more than two million inhabitants; Ire-

land and Scotland were relatively more popu-
The growth of population.
lous then than now, and perhaps the total

population of early Britain numbered three or three and a half millions. The mediæval period saw only a slight increase, but since the reign of Henry VII numbers have steadily grown, except in Ireland, where, during the past fifty years, they have declined. The two islands now contain about 42,000,000 people. Probably 10,000,000 people of British descent live in other parts of the empire which Britain has built up, and their fellow subjects of different origin number, in addition, some 350,000,000. The inhabitants of the empire speak a great variety of languages; of about 50,000,000, English is the

mother tongue and the vast majority of the
The English language.
75,000,000 of the United States also speak it, while a hundred years ago it was the tongue of little more than 20,000,000 in all. It is at its base a Teutonic tongue, but has added so many French and Latin elements that it is readily understood by the peoples of both northern and southern Europe. For

practical purposes it is lucid and concise, and its grammar is simple. Already English is the dominant language in North America, Australasia, and South Africa; it is heard in every great seaport of the world and tends to become the language of international commerce, and by this ready medium English moral and political ideals gain an ever-wider currency. William the Conqueror ruled about 2,000,000 Englishmen; his successor now on the throne holds sway over only a little less than one-fourth of the earth's surface and over rather more than one-fourth of its inhabitants, and the despised tongue of the people whom William conquered has become the language of a noble literature and of the two greatest commercial states of the world.

BOOKS FOR REFERENCE

* George, *Relations of Geography and History* (1901); MacKinder's *Britain and the British Seas* (1902); * Réclus (edited by Ravenstein), *The Earth and its Inhabitants: Europe*, vol. iv (*The British Isles*) (no date); Ripley, *Races of Europe* (1899); Dawkins, *Early Man in Britain* (1880); * Taine, *Notes on England* (translated by W. F. Rae) (1885).

CHAPTER II

The Roman and the English Conquests

(55 B. C. to about 577 A. D.—632 years)

[The salient features of the period are the decline of Rome's military power before the inroads of the Teutonic tribes from the north, and the decline of the old Paganism before the advance of the Christian religion. Christianity was from the first aggressive against all other systems. The Roman emperors tried to stamp it out as a conspiracy against their supreme authority, but it grew under persecution, and finally the Emperor Constantine not only recognised it, but favoured it at the expense of the old Paganism. The Roman state soon became Christian in name and encouraged Christian missionary effort. Teutonic tribes from northern Europe—such as the Goths, who invaded Italy and settled finally in Spain, the Burgundians, who conquered a part of Gaul, and the Franks, who changed the name Gaul into France—adopted Christianity as they moved southward, and all, except the Franks, in the heretical form known as Arianism; while those who remained in the northern home were still Pagans. In 410 Rome had grown so weak that the Goths took and sacked the Imperial City, to the horror of the civilized world. In 455 the Vandals from north Africa repeated the incident, and in 476 Teutonic soldiers under Odoacer finally overthrew the Roman emperor who ruled in the west. There still remained a Roman Empire with its seat in the new Rome—Constantinople—and its rulers still claimed sway over the whole Roman world. Justinian made this sway real for a time in Italy, but western Europe never again came under the old Roman system, which fell in 476.]


WHEN the Britons first appear in written history they are still rude, but have something like civilization. In the rush of conflict they threw off some of their garments, and it is this probably which gave rise to the mistaken opinion that they were naked savages who painted

and tattooed their bodies. Tried warriors trembled before the fierce vigour of the Britons in the field. Their

The culture of
the early
Britons.

horses drew into battle terrible chariots with scythes projecting from the axles of the wheels.

Primitive barbarism had passed away, and visitors to the island were surprised at the large population, the many villages, the herds of cattle, and the extensive cultivation of grain. In the south and west were tin and lead mines, and there was apparently a considerable trade with the Continent. The



CONJECTURAL BRITISH WAR CHARIOT.

Britons made a coarse cloth, and delighted to array




BRITONS, SHOWING NATIVE COSTUME.

themselves in varied and flaming colours. The men wore long hair and shaved their faces, with the exception of the upper lip. Hospitality—a frequent virtue of rude peoples—was general, and music and athletic exercises aided the entertainment of the guests. While the Britons were active and formidable in war, the uneventful labours of peace found

among them little favour. They were vain, idle, and quarrelsome.

The British tribes were ruled by princes, whose power was great, but not absolute, since the freemen of the tribe decided important matters. The religion was Druidism, of which we know but dimly the real meaning. The Druids professed to understand both the movements of the heavenly bodies and their influence upon human destiny. They taught belief in the life of the soul after death, and the High Priest claimed a dignity and authority not unlike the later supremacy of the Roman Pontiff. Druid worship was not in temples, but in oak groves, and it sometimes

Government
and religion of
the Britons.



ROMAN SEA-GOING GALLEY.

included the horrid sacrifice of condemned criminals, who were confined in huge wicker baskets and burned. The priesthood surrounded itself with mystery, trained its students in remote forests, and intrusted Druid doctrines to memory only, not to writing. Upon the society of the time the Druids exercised a potent influence. Justice and education were in the hands of the priests, while Druid bards went about the country and used verse and music as effective instruments to arouse and control opinion.

Into this rude world penetrated at last the imperial Roman. Julius Cæsar conquered Gaul, and beyond its

coasts lay Britain, a region to him vague and undefined, which might be a menace to the new Roman province.

The Roman
invasion of
Britain.

Fugitives from Gaul had doubtless sought

refuge in the is-
land, and in the

summer of 55 B. C., Cæsar made a hurried expedition across the Straits of Dover. After a short and indecisive campaign he retired, but returned in the next year with a force numbering more than 25,000. The Britons, warring among themselves and awed by the discipline of the Roman legions, yielded a nominal submission.

The Roman Senate decreed twenty days' thanksgiving for Cæsar's new and glorious conquest, and Britain became, and long remained, a province of the Roman Empire.



CLAUDIUS (B. C. 10 TO A. D. 54).



JULIUS CÆSAR (B. C. 100-44).

For ninety years no attempt was made to hold it in real subjection, since the country offered little to the ambition of a Roman proconsul, but at length ceaseless quarrels among the Britons brought back the Romans, who in A. D. 43 resumed the conquest with stern vigour. The Emperor Claudius himself went to the island to direct the work, but the Britons did not yield without a fierce struggle. Caradoc or Caractacus, leader of the Silures,

the most stubborn of the tribes, was taken through treachery about 51, and carried in chains to Rome. When the Romans had already been fighting in Britain for

twenty years, Suetonius Paulinus marched across the country, threw a force into the sacred home of Druidism, Mona (now the Island of Anglesey), off the coast of Wales, destroyed both the priests and their groves, and broke forever the power of the sacerdotal caste which had been used to arouse the islanders. The conquerors behaved with ruthless brutality. They publicly flogged and subjected to vile outrage Boadicea, widow of the chief of the Iceni, a British tribe, with her two daughters, and the Celtic

The struggle of the Britons against the Romans.



ROMAN SOLDIER.

population of the east and south broke out in consequence into revolt, which for a time swept everything before it, and cost thousands of Roman lives. Rome prevailed in the end, but with terrible slaughter, and Boadicea perished by her own hand.

It was Agricola, a famous Roman general, who completed the work of subjugation, and then he proceeded to a needed reform of the Roman administration. The British paid at least a part of their taxes in corn, and corrupt Roman officials had bought up all the available grain, and forced the British to buy it back at an enhanced price and immediately to return it to their oppressors in payment of taxes. Agricola gave the wasted country good government. He built a wall and a line of forts from the Clyde to the Firth of Forth, tried, but without success, to conquer the tribes living in the glens of the Scottish Highlands, and would also have attempted to subdue Ireland had he not been recalled to Rome. The limits of Roman dominion which he was obliged to

Agricola's government.

recognise were never exceeded by those who came after him. The Emperor Hadrian, indeed, half a century

The limits of Roman sovereignty. later, built a new wall, running to the south of that

of Agricola, from the Solway to the Tyne (Carlisle to Newcastle).

York was conveniently situated to check barbarian inroads from the north, and became the military capital. London,

within easy reach of the Continent and

at the lowest point where the Thames could readily be crossed to the south, was the chief commercial centre.

Until about 400 A. D. Rome continued to rule Britain and kept in the country 20,000 or more troops. Under

Roman civilization in Britain. her cruel sway many British prisoners were carried off to be sacrificed in the Roman arena, and others of the enslaved inhabitants were

forced to work the mines and to till the soil for their conquerors. But Rome did much to make Britain a civilized




COIN OF HADRIAN.



PART OF THE ROMAN WALL AT THE PRESENT DAY.

state. Forests were cleared to widen the area under cultivation, and a great corn trade grew up between Britain

and the Roman colonies on the Rhine. The Roman introduced the beech-tree, and the nuts of the beech forests helped to feed great herds of swine for centuries to come.



BIRD'S-EYE VIEW OF ROMAN PLAN OF A TOWN.

A, the Town; *B*, the Escarpment; *C C*, the Walls; *D*, the Castle; *E E*, the Watch-Towers.

The country began to assume the features of a well-governed province. Roman justice was stern, but it was better than the former appeal to brute force, and tribal wars for the time disappeared. The conqueror built towns, and introduced the sensuous luxury of Rome: in amphitheatres, traces of which still remain, the islanders saw the cruel sports of the capital, and the Roman theatre was translated to Britain. Palaces and villas of stone, scattered over the whole land, revealed the wealth of the master, while the squalor of the British slave appeared in the hovels, often propped against the outer wall. The shivering Italian met the chill of the northern winter by ingenious heating contrivances, and constructed baths

on a scale trifling indeed as compared with those of Rome, but magnificent for a remote province. He built, probably by the labours of the enslaved Britons, great roads—four converging at London, three at Chester, two at Bath—partly to assist commerce, but mainly, we may believe, for moving troops easily, and thus holding the conquered tribes in subjection.


Probably few Romans of the first rank ever dwelt in Britain. Officials, traders, and soldiers went thither from Rome, as they now go to India from England, and ruled a subject population by virtue of superior organization and culture. Though

Extent of
Roman
influence.

the Gauls readily forgot their tongue for that of Rome, apparently the Britons never in large numbers gave up theirs. Some chieftains adopted the language of the conqueror, his dress and civilization, and even a fictitious Roman pedigree, and Rome, in Britain as elsewhere, used such leaders as agents of her own supremacy. The tax-gatherer did his sordid work, and the burden became ever more crushing, espe-

cially for
Hadrian in 119,
Severus in 208-
211, Constan-
tius in 296, Con-
stantine in 306.

the well-to-do citizens of the towns. An emperor, ambitious to survey even the outlying parts of his dominions, occasionally reached



Britain and gave the island a temporary importance by his presence. Every year the conscription carried off drafts of men: British recruits served Rome in Gaul and Spain and on the Danube and the Euphrates. On the other hand, Christian missionaries carried to Britain what became in 313 the religion of the emperor, and many of the Roman masters, and of their British dependents and slaves, accepted the faith of Christ.

The Piets or Caledonians from the north, the Scots from what is now Ireland, Saxons from across the North Sea, harassed the Roman power, and penetrated sometimes as far as London. Towards the end of the fourth century the feebleness of Rome's sway was seen when more than one rebel general was proclaimed Emperor in Britain by his soldiers, and crossed to Gaul in a vain attempt to march to the capital. The later days of Roman rule were marked by bad, because weak, government, and by 400 A. D. Rome's course in Britain was well-nigh run. The Goth was hovering on the Italian frontier, and at length, in the earlier years of the fifth century, Alaric poured his hosts into Italy. The Roman court found a secure refuge behind the marshes of Ravenna, while Alaric pressed on to besiege Rome itself. To meet the peril the troops had already been recalled from Britain, and when in 410 the civilized world was horror-stricken by the fall and sack of Rome, the islanders were left to their fate.

The Romans had found the Britons a warlike people, but they left them enfeebled by long bondage. Wild neighbours, who had never known the yoke of Rome, soon attacked the Britons who held regions more inviting than their own. We know almost nothing of the details of this new invasion; but the Piets from the north were the strongest assailants, while the Scots from Ire-

The decline of
the Roman
power in
Britain.

The weakness of
Britain invites
barbarian
attacks.

land¹ made a comparatively feeble attack, owing, no doubt, to the difficulty of throwing any considerable force across the Irish Sea. The Britons still appealed to Rome, for the country remained a nominal Roman province, but Rome could do nothing, and Vortigern, the British ruler, finally sought a new ally. The eastern and south-

The coming of
the English.

eastern coasts of Britain had long been haunted by rovers, who came from the North Sea in huge piratical crafts. They were Teutons, kindred in blood to the Goths, Burgundians, and Sueves, who had struck deadly blows at Rome's power in Italy, Gaul, and Spain, and Vortigern asked their aid against his foes. They came, drove back the Picts, and then, resolving to hold the land for themselves, turned against Vortigern.

Beginning
about 449.

The Jutes, under their leaders, known to us by what are apparently the nicknames "Hengist" and "Horsa"—"the Horse" and "the Mare"—conquered and settled in Kent, and the whole tribe, with its women, children, and cattle, seems to have crossed from what is now Jutland, in Denmark, to Britain, leaving the region whence they came deserted for two or three centuries. Jutes went also to the Isle of Wight. To the regions farther west, and also to the north of the Jutish settlement in Kent, came the Saxons, and still farther north settled other Germans, the Angles. The names Sussex—South Saxons, Essex—East Saxons, and East Anglia reveal to this day the localities attacked by these marauders. In what numbers they came we do not know. Each band of assailants waged war for itself, and sometimes Teuton fought Teuton, but the main struggle was between the Teuton and the Celtic Briton whom he was driving back. Arthur, if not wholly a legendary person, appears to have been a Celtic prince in the southwest who

¹ There was later an extensive migration of Scots to Caledonia, which then became Scotland.

struggled with the invader in the first half of the sixth century. There was savage hatred on both sides, and the animosity of religion was added to that of race, for the Britons had accepted Christianity, while their assailants were still pagan. The conflict lasted for a century and a half. At Deorham, near Bristol, in 577, and at Chester in the Northwest in 613, decisive victories were won by the invader, and henceforth his sway was almost undisputed over the greater part of England. The mountainous regions of Wales, of Cornwall, and of Devon became the refuge of the Britons, and there to this day dwell the descendants of the people whom the English conqueror drove back.

The peoples who thus triumphed are probably the ancestors of by far the greater part of the English of the present day. The historian Tacitus, writing in the first century of the Christian era, when the rude Teutons of the far north were becoming more fully known, professed to find in them a moral vigour that Rome had lost, but perhaps to the censorious Roman the vices of his countrymen were magnified, because near at hand, while those of the Teutons were softened by distance. He describes their powerful frames, their fierce love of war, chivalrous respect for women, and purity of social life. They had rude liberties for which no room could be found under the Roman emperors: the freemen gathered from time to time in an assembly that settled the important affairs of the tribes and they chose the leader in war, who rallied about himself a band of companions eager to emulate his bravest actions. In fighting, the idle warrior indeed excelled; but he scorned the labour of the field, and left it to women, old men, and slaves. He spent his leisure ignobly in drinking and gambling, and often wagered his own liberty in a game of chance.

The conquering Englishman came from a rough country covered with timber and scrub, with barren heath and bog, and he found in Britain the elements of a high civilization—fertile land, cleared, drained, and tilled in the Roman manner; orchards and vineyards, horses, cattle, sheep, and swine. There were walled towns and country houses, roads, bridges, lighthouses, harbours, mines, quarries, and fisheries. Rude and uncivilized as he was, he must have found a use for some of these things, and he can scarcely have been guilty of extirpating the natives, whose labour would have been to him invaluable. In some cases it

The relations of the English and the Britons. was bands of men only who descended upon Britain; nothing is more likely than that

women of the opposing race became the slaves, concubines, or wives of Englishmen, and that in the veins of some of the next generation flowed the blood of the two races. The slave-trade flourished at the time and members of the successful race were, we know, offered for sale in the slave-markets of Continental Europe; without doubt many of the conquered Britons were likewise sold, but many others probably served the new master, tilled his fields and worked his mines. Except in the mountainous regions of the west, he was everywhere supreme.

BOOKS FOR REFERENCE

Merivale, *History of the Romans under the Empire* (8 vols., 1890), (chapters x, li, lxi, and lxvi relate especially to Britain); * Windle, *Life in Early Britain* (1897); * Scarth, *Roman Britain* (1883); * Rhys, *Celtic Britain* (1884); * Grant Allen, *Anglo-Saxon England* (1881).

CHAPTER III

The Conversion of England

[The Roman Church had deferred to the authority of the emperors until Pope Gregory the Great (590–604), ruling at Rome, practically defied the distant ruler at Constantinople. The independence of the Roman Church then grew steadily. She demanded obedience from all the churches of the west, and even claimed the right to make and unmake kings, for in 754 she deposed the old Merovingian line of kings in France, and consecrated in its place the new Carolingian line. The Goths, Burgundians, and others, who had been Arians, gave up this heresy in time and recognised the authority of Rome; the missionaries who carried Christianity to the north of Europe worked in communion with her, and before the Norman Conquest of England the whole of western Christendom conformed to the Roman model. In the east and south Christianity was meanwhile losing ground. Mohammed, when he died in 632, had already won Arabia to the faith of Islam. Jerusalem soon fell, Syria was conquered, and within a hundred years Islam was supreme in the whole of north Africa and in the Spanish peninsula—regions which, except Spain, it holds to this day.]

FROM the third century, at least, there was a Christian Church in Britain, and a land once Christian became again pagan for a time when conquered by the English barbarian. But before the sixth century closed Rome was planning to reoccupy Britain in a new and deeper way. The monk Gregory, walking through the market-place of Rome, saw some fair-haired children offered for sale. Struck by their beauty, he asked whence they came, and was told that they were Angles from Deira, a division of Britain, whose king was Ella. They shall become fellow-heirs with the *angels*, snatched

Pope Gregory the Great and the Roman mission to England.

About 574.

from wrath (*de ira*) to sing *Alleluia*, was Gregory's punning comment. He had already sacrificed wealth and a great position to become a monk, and now, full of missionary zeal, determined to go to distant England. He set out, but when the Roman populace, who trusted to his guidance in those troubled days, learned that he had gone, they raised a tumult and insisted that he should be recalled. Gregory returned, and in time became Pope; but England was upon his conscience, and, when he could, he organized a strong mission, with about forty members, to go thither. Augustine, the Abbot of St. Andrews, a monastery established by Gregory in his own ancestral palace, was made leader, but on the journey he heard such tales of the fierce English that he sent back, asking permission to return. Gregory insisted that he should proceed, and after a year's delay the missionaries reached Kent. Its ruler, Ethelbert, had

The conversion
of Kent, 597.

bert, had
raised his
small state

to pre-eminence among the petty kingdoms into which the invaders had divided the country. As Ethelbert's wife Bertha, a member of the Frankish royal house, was a Christian,

his court was familiar with the Christian services held by Bertha's chaplain, and in some degree the missionaries'



path was already cleared. The king received Augustine and his band with polite caution, assigned them a lodging in his capital, Canterbury, and, after a wise pause for reflection, decided to accept Christianity. He was baptized, and the faith that had convinced the prince found easy acceptance among his obedient people. Kent became Christian in name; we hear of the baptism on one Christmas day of no less than 10,000 converts.

The missionaries, cheered by this first success, pressed on to occupy more of the country, and found a ready welcome, but the rapid conversions can have involved no deep moral change. In Wales and Cornwall there still remained among the Christian Britons driven back by the English a Church of long standing. The newcomers made attempts to co-operate with it, but found unexpected barriers. Augustine's narrow mind was shocked at divergences from Roman usage, which had lingered in Britain from an earlier age. He was urged by Gregory to adopt

Conflict between
the Roman and
the early British
Churches.



BISHOP (about Tenth Century).

a liberal policy of conciliation in non-essentials, but was arrogant in tone, while the British were suspicious of the strangers. To shave the front part of the priest's head from ear-tip to ear-tip, instead of following the Roman custom of the shaven crown; to immerse candidates for baptism once only, instead of three times; to use a method of reckoning the date of Easter differing from the Roman, do not at first seem variations about which serious men should feel strongly. But the peremptory demand of submission to Roman custom and supremacy was involved

in the dispute, and the British Church indignantly refused to hold intercourse with the newcomers on such terms, and broke off all communications. The Romans meanwhile made their way to the north and fixed upon York, the ancient capital, as the northern centre of their work, with Paulinus as their first bishop. In some places paganism fought tenaciously for the old gods, Woden and Thor. Penda, King of Mercia, made himself their champion, but after his death in 655 there was no force that could resist permanently the moral vigour of the new faith. Within less than a hundred years after Augustine's landing Christianity found almost universal acceptance in Britain.

Ireland was, apparently, not reached by Christian effort during the period of Roman rule in Britain, but soon after, Patrick, a native of Dumbarton, within
 The planting of Christianity in Ireland. what is now Scotland, was fired with Christian zeal for the land so near his own home.

He prepared himself in Gaul for the task, and then went to his chosen field with high qualifications for winning a rude, emotional, and generous people, among
 From about 425-469. whom idolatry had already declined; he respected their prejudices, paid freely for what was furnished him, and won success by his tact and zeal. Bridget, known in England as St. Bride, was the daughter of an Ulster chieftain, and has an honourable place in Irish history as the leader, in the sixth century, of a movement to establish convents for women. Ireland had a vigorous Christian Church a hundred and fifty years before Augustine reached England. The people were, like the English, divided into tribes, and the head of the tribe became not infrequently the chief Christian pastor, and handed down the office to his heir. Bishops in Ireland were many and of slight authority, and perhaps on this account the Church lacked cohesion and discipline. But the Irish monasteries showed great missionary zeal. The

island was almost free from the race struggle that wasted Britain, and Christian life developed rapidly: when the seventh century opened it was from Ireland that the chief efforts proceeded to convert the neighbouring heathen peoples.

Among the islands off the west coast of Scotland lies the tiny Iona, to which the feet of pilgrims still turn reverently; for it was there that a missionary from Ireland, Columba, built a monastery from which to evangelize the pagan Highlands of Scotland; the Lowlands, we know in a dim way, had already been reached by Ninian. Not only to the Highlands, but also to the north of England went missionaries from Iona. Oswald, a prince of Northumbria, one of the English petty kingdoms, fled from strife at home to Iona, and when a turn of fortune made him king he asked Iona to send missionaries to teach his people.

The gentle Aidan was chosen to go, and he made Holy Isle, a small islet off the east coast of England, a second Iona. Aidan and his band of followers travelled through Northumbria on foot, preaching in every village and winning many converts. Soon these missionaries from the north met the Romans making their way from the south, and conflict and rivalry followed. The Scots clung to the peculiar customs which they shared with the older British Church while the Roman party, led by Wilfrid, a young English monk of noble birth, insisted upon uniformity, and urged, with some arrogance, that the rude and uneducated Scots should conform to what cultivated Rome required. Finally a conference, under King Oswy of Northumbria, was held at Whitby in 664, to debate and settle the differences. For the Scots, Colman, the leader, pressed hard his point that his observance of Easter had the sanction of St. John. Wilfrid, on the other hand, urged that his were the customs of St. Peter, and that to St.

Peter were given the keys of heaven ; and the king, whose decision both sides appear to have regarded as final, promptly said that he should not go against the door-keeper of heaven, lest the gates might not open to him

when he asked admission. On every point the Roman party triumphed. Most of the Scots retired rather than yield, and thus gave Rome a free hand in reorganizing the English Church.

The triumph of the Roman customs over the Irish.

In 668, Pope Vitalian sent to England, as Archbishop of Canterbury, Theodore of Tarsus, whose genius for order and discipline was much needed. The dioceses were huge, the bishops few, the clergy scattered ; pestilence was desolating England, and there was much laxity and ignorance. Theodore carried on his work with great energy and capacity. At the Council of Hertford, in 673, he took solemn pledges from the English bishops to be zealous in their work and to conform to the Roman model. Synods henceforth met annually, and the Church, with such union and co-operation, was soon less completely subject to the authority of the petty kings. The whole land was in fact united by Theodore in one vigorous ecclesiastical system long before political union was thought of.

After Theodore, no longer Romans, but Englishmen, ruled the English Church. She grew rapidly in authority, wealth, and culture : kings bestowed upon her lands and tithes, dying sinners bequeathed to her their property to secure her prayers,

The condition of the Church after Theodore.

and rich men founded monasteries and gave lands for their support. In that age of rude violence the monasteries were havens of security and peace. The calm life of the monk Bede at the monastery of Jarrow in the north (673-735), his zeal for knowledge, his quiet days of prayer and study, his work as a teacher and a writer, stand in pleasing contrast with the surrounding scenes of blood and strife, and in a society where such a career was

possible there must have been strong forces working for order. The 600 monks at Jarrow taught the people agriculture, opened schools, and helped the poor and the sick, who were very numerous in that age of pestilence. The English parishes were well organized, and the cathedrals, already multiplying, became centres of worship. The Church had hospitals, almshouses, and hostels for the reception of poor travellers, and light went forth from England to the dark places of Europe: Boniface and other English missionaries evangelized Germany, and the great Charlemagne chose an Englishman, Alcuin, to lead in his work of education.

Alcuin
selected, 782.

But prosperity was full of perils to the Church. Wealth fostered covetousness. Bishops and abbots, who played a large part in secular affairs, became worldly; offices endowed by piety were bought and sold for the riches and rank which went with them; some of those sheltered by the monasteries lived in vicious luxury, and careless abbots, with the privilege, in many cases, of freedom from the bishop's oversight, allowed abuses to flourish without check. We hear of the love of money, and of the drunkenness, profligacy, and impure conversation of some of those devoted in name to holy things; of monks who will not study, who recite the mass without understanding its meaning, and put away the monkish costume to wear rich and gorgeously coloured apparel. The convents for women were also not free from scandal, and on the whole by the ninth century monastic life in England seems to have sunk very low. The better spirits of the time deplored these evils; bishops and synods rebuked them, and both King Alfred and Dunstan, a later Archbishop of Canterbury, did strenuous work for reform.

The corruption
of the Church.


But it cannot be doubted that the Church, with all her defects, was still the strongest organizing force in early English life. She aided progress by her contact

with the best culture of the Continent, and she had authority that commanded respect and even fear. Her rulers shared the prejudices of the upper classes to which they belonged, and, like them, were sometimes oppressors; but in her best moments she was the friend of the distressed and the outcast, the enemy of strife and bloodshed, the instructor of the young and the penitent. Over even the rulers of the state she, in time, claimed authority. In 943, Odo, Archbishop of Canterbury, tells kings and princes that they must obey the bishops, who have the keys of the kingdom of heaven. The time was to come when such claims provoked strife; in early England they must have helped to check secular violence and to promote order.


BOOKS FOR REFERENCE

* Hunt, *History of the English Church from its Foundation to the Norman Conquest, 597-1066* (1899); Bright, *Chapters of Early English Church History* (1897); * Stokes, *Ireland and the Celtic Church* (1892).

THE ENGLISH KINGS FROM EGBERT TO EDWARD THE CONFESSOR



THE DANISH KINGS OF ENGLAND



NOTE.—Harold, who succeeded Edward the Confessor, was of royal blood on his mother's side, being the great-great-grandson of Harold Bluetooth, ancestor of Sweyn and Canute.

CHAPTER IV

From the English to the Norman Conquest

(577 to 1066—489 years)

[The most striking characteristic of the period in Europe is the attempt made by the Teutonic assailants of the Roman Empire themselves to revive that empire and to restore its old universal authority, but now as the *Holy* Roman Empire with the deeper sanctions of the Christian religion. Charlemagne (or, in the Teutonic form of his name, Karl der Grosse, Charles the Great), who ruled France and part of Germany, and was supreme in Italy, was crowned by the Pope as Roman Emperor in 800 A. D. In theory his authority displaced that of the other line of Roman emperors who still ruled at Constantinople; but it was found impossible to revive in the west the old centralized Roman administration, and the restored Christian empire, though it continued until 1806, was always rather a theory than a political reality. Europe, instead of owning the single sway of Rome, was breaking up into a number of small states. Feudalism begins during this period. Under it the lord, in charge of a province—in France, for instance—ruled it as if he were an independent sovereign, and recognised but slightly the authority of his distant king. After Charlemagne, Western Europe met a new peril in the sea-rovers from the north, who haunted its shores and caused great terror and disorder. Coming by sea, they could descend suddenly and unexpectedly upon unprotected places, and it was long before those assailed were prepared to meet such attacks. Only, indeed, when these Northmen (Normans) were themselves supreme in England and in important parts of France and Italy did the attacks wholly cease.]

ENGLAND was long divided into a number of small states, sometimes at war with each other and with varying boundaries: the traditional seven kingdoms (the Heptarchy) were not permanent divisions. Northumbria, with its two sections of Bernicia and Deira, held from about


600 to 735 the chief place and claimed supremacy, but was humbled first by its neighbour Mercia and then by the attacks of a new generation of sea-rovers from the north. Before 800 the Danes began to find out the attractions of England and the weakness of its people, who had almost abandoned the sea. The invaders' flat-bottomed boats were so light in draft that they took them far up the rivers into the interior, and, upon landing, their usual

The divided
condition of
England and
the final
supremacy of
Wessex.



DANISH, OR VIKING, BOAT.

practice was to seize the available horses, so as to be able to move rapidly and to retire quickly. At first they were mere robbers and destroyers, who burned towns and villages and desolated large areas; but they were shrewd enough to see that England was a better country than their own, and in time they resolved to conquer and to hold it. The English were quarrelling among themselves. Offa, King of Mercia, who died in 796, tried to reach a final division of England into three kingdoms—Northumbria in the north, Mercia in the midlands, and Wessex in the south and west. For a time it seemed as if this arrangement would endure, but Northumbria was already weak, and Wessex, proving stronger than the others, was able under Egbert to humble Mercia in 829, and to take the first place. Her remoteness made her less subject to



ALFRED'S ENGLAND

WITH DETAIL FOR PERIOD
PRIOR TO
NORMAN CONQUEST.



Longitude 2 West from Greenwich 0 East from Greenwich

Danish attacks, and she was also strong in an able line of kings, the greatest of whom is Alfred.

The political history of England before Alfred's time is bewildering in changes of little moment to later ages ;

with Alfred come simpler but graver problems. He disputed the Danes' supremacy upon the sea by building boats to attack them, and his land forces he also reorganized

so as to check attack more effectively. The

law was that all freemen must, at the king's call, serve in the national host (the fyrd), and aid, as required, in making fortifications, roads, and bridges. But such levies were sure to be raw and unskilful, and Alfred adopted the plan

of calling out only half of the fighting men at a time, but of keeping them long enough for thorough training, while the other half remained at home to sow and reap. He placed in the menaced districts

garrisons, protected by stockades

and even by stone works, which held back the invaders and checked their

forays. Alfred, wise enough to yield to

stern necessity, consented to give the

Danes the northeastern half of England.

The old political divisions disappeared,

and two new ones took their place—the

Danelaw in the northeast,

where ruled the Dane in

England, the south and

west, with Alfred as king. Alfred was

the real victor, for the assailants now

agreed to abandon paganism and to ac-

cept the religion of the Christian Eng-

lish. Unconsciously the heathen Dane wrought for unity

among the peoples of the two islands, for the assaults of

a common foe led Scotland, Ireland, and Wales to recog-

Alfred's character and work in resisting the Danes, 871-901.

The influence of the Danes.



SOLDIER,
NINTH CENTURY.

nise the strong leadership of the rulers of Wessex, who became their overlords. When the Dane accepted Christianity the main difference between him and the Englishman disappeared, for they were alike Teutons, and had the same type of social organization. Settling down to a regular life in England, the Dane soon lost his wild daring; he had now something to lose, and was no longer a mere freebooter.

Alfred's reign marks the beginning of a new constructive epoch in English history. Not only was he a soldier: he was a statesman, a scholar, almost a saint, and is the only Englishman before the Norman Conquest whose name is a household word to posterity. He worked always for the good of his people, and made his court a scene of busy activity. He drew up a new code of laws, enforced firm justice, founded schools, and himself translated books that would aid education. The Church was corrupt, the clergy were ignorant, religion was in a state of decay, and Alfred attacked these evils. He had no insular prejudices, and appointed to office, especially in the Church, the best men he could find at home or abroad.

Alfred was succeeded by a long line of kings for the most part only less virtuous and able than himself: the rapid decline of the Merovingian and of the Carlovingian lines in France finds no parallel in England. Edward the Elder, Athelstan, Edmund, Edred, Edwy, Edgar, and Edward were, with the exception of Edwy and Edward, strong men. They governed for nearly a hundred years, and their firm and aggressive rule extended finally over nearly all of England. The Danelaw was the constant object of their attacks. Edward the Elder forced the Danes to recognise his overlordship of the whole island. Edred, the son of Edward, built a fort close to every Danish town and slowly wore down, and finally conquered the Danes. But he estab-

The greatness
of Alfred.

The successors
of Alfred, 901-
979.

lished no centralized monarchy. Charles the Great had failed when he tried, a century before Alfred, to revive this old Roman type of rule, and the reconquest of the Dane-law was not followed by any attempt on his lines. The king named great earls to rule the conquered districts. They were practically sovereigns, but in theory the king might at any time remove the agents to whom he committed such large powers.

Dunstan, Archbishop of Canterbury, is the only conspicuous statesman, not himself royal, who exercised almost

The reorgani-
zing work of
Dunstan and
the rule of
Edgar.

regal power in England prior to the Norman Conquest. His influence extended over the long period from 946 to 988, and his chief aim was to revive the Church's life which the

Danish struggle had crippled, but his imperial mind dominated both church and state. He checked the laxity of the clergy, and was specially severe on married priests; he enforced upon monks the sternest discipline of the Benedictine rule, and brought about in the southwest a revival of spiritual life and of learning that recalled the days of Bede in the north. Dunstan ventured to rebuke and was sent into exile by Edwy, one of the few incapable sovereigns of the line of Alfred; but this weak king was soon himself deposed, and his early death was followed by the vigorous reign of Edgar, aided by Dunstan. The great earls retained sway in their provinces; Edgar himself ruled directly over Wessex only, but every summer he sailed or was rowed round Britain, and in his train were subject princes, upon whose exercise of authority he kept a close watch. His system shows that England had already become a feudal kingdom, strong when governed by a strong man, but lacking organic unity. The great earls had every selfish motive to assert their own authority at the expense of the king's, and it was only the hammer of foreign conquest that in the end welded the nation into one.

Edgar was the last able English king of Alfred's line, and his son Edward, dying young, was succeeded in 979 by another son, Ethelred, known in Eng-

The weak reign
of Ethelred and
the revival of
Danish attack.

lish history as Ethelred the Unready, or Redeless, the king without wisdom. In the north

of Europe the Danish power was more formidable than ever, and the weak and vicious rule of Ethelred invited renewed attack. Even a strong man could scarcely have triumphed over the evils that threatened



COIN OF EDGAR.

England, for Norway and Denmark both sent out hosts of assailants, still pagan and savage. It is a gloomy tale, first of fierce attacks, then of weak compromise by Ethelred in buying off the invader with the proceeds of a special tax called the Danegeld, and in the end of treacherous massacre: on St. Bride's day, November 13, 1002, by Ethelred's

order, all the Danes in England whom he could seize were slaughtered. The Danish retaliation was fearful; Sweyn their leader and Canute his son began the systematic conquest of England, and did not stay their hand until in 1013 they forced the English to accept Sweyn as king. But Sweyn's rule was short, for he died in 1014. Ethelred's hopes revived at his rival's death; for a time he was able to assert his authority, but he too died in 1016, and then Sweyn's son, Canute, struggled with Ethelred's son, Edmund Ironside. The mettle of the English improved under an able leader. Edmund at length ruled half the land, but he fell in 1016 before a murderer's blow. In 1016 all England united in naming Canute king, and for twenty-five years foreign sovereigns ruled the English.

During these twenty-five years England was in truth not ill-governed. Probably few Danes emigrated to England, except to centres like London. Little as the mild

and gentle spirit of Christianity had permeated England's social life, she was yet a Christian state, and Canute, a pagan at home, became, like so many of the northern assailants of the more enlightened south, a Christian, by contact with Christian society. Once more was seen the spectacle, familiar in history, of the conqueror subdued by the conquered. The virtuous and just rule of the converted Dane showed the sincerity of his new convictions. Peace and order were found in England, commerce expanded, some of the towns grew rapidly. Canute identified himself with the ancient royal house by marrying the widow of Ethelred, and he made England the most important state in a great Teutonic empire of the north, which included Norway, Sweden, and Denmark, and rivalled in power its contemporary, the Holy Roman Empire. England sent ecclesiastics to

Denmark, and the weight of influence was rather of England upon

Denmark than of Denmark upon England. Canute ruled the country (divided into the four great earldoms of Northumbria, Mercia, East Anglia, and Wessex) frugally, and yet in a liberal spirit. A mercenary force, known as the House Carls, gave military support to his authority, which had, however, a firmer basis in its justice and his own high sense of duty. His long reign was followed by the short and unworthy ones of his two sons, Harold and Hardicanute, the latter the son of Emma or Elgiva, the widow of Ethelred the Unready. Hardicanute was the last of the Danish kings, and at his death the minds of the English turned to Edward, their king's half-brother, the son of

The rule of the
Danish kings.

Canute and his
successors.



KING CANUTE (994?-1035).
Note the costume.

Emma and Ethelred the Unready. Thus without renewed revolution or violence did the sovereignty come back to the old line of Wessex.

The age of Edward the Confessor was one in which a new-born zeal for the Christian religion urged the virtue

The reign of
Edward the
Confessor,
1042-1066.

of monastic seclusion at the expense of the common duties of daily life. Secular society was indeed violent; in it he only was secure who had a strong arm for his defence, while

the monastery, protected by the Church, was safe, and there is little wonder that, amid the turmoil of the world, it seemed to provide the only path to heaven. Edward was

The character
of Edward.

a monk not in name but in spirit, and is the only

English king whom the Church has formally called a saint. He proved idle and ineffective in affairs of state, and his weak nature opened the way to the influence of favourites. Men said, in contempt, that if a chosen confessor declared a black crow to be white the king would believe him in defiance of his own eyesight.

A hundred years before Edward, adventurers from the north, akin to those who were haunting the English

The rise of
Norman power.

coasts, had seized that part of France which lay about the river Seine. The weak

French monarchy could not drive back

these barbarians, and soon after Alfred divided England with the Danes, Charles the Simple, King of France, was forced to make terms with the Normans. In 911 Rolf or Rollo, their leader, secured possession of the land he had conquered, on condition that he should become the feudal vassal of the King of France and be baptized into the




EMMA, WIFE OF ETHELRED AND CANUTE, AND MOTHER OF EDWARD THE CONFESSOR (D. 1052).

Christian faith. Apparently many of his warriors married French women, and within a hundred years the Normans knew only the French tongue. They mastered rapidly the best elements of the civilization of the time. It was in architecture that the age expressed its highest ideas, and the Normans became great builders, and honoured their new faith with noble structures, unequalled before in number, extent, and massiveness.

Edward was related through his mother, Emma, to the Norman ducal house. He was reared at that court, and the Norman tongue, Norman manners, Norman fashions, were those with which he was familiar. England seemed to him a rude and barbarous country, and it is little wonder that, when king, he encouraged Norman influences at his court. The French tongue was introduced, and English courtiers had to make clumsy efforts to utter its unfamiliar sounds. Foreign prelates were appointed to Canterbury, London, and other sees. Norman abbots ruled in English monasteries, and Norman landowners lived upon English lands. Edward's weak mind surrendered unreserved-

The Norman
predilections of
Edward the
Confessor.



WOODEN CHURCH AT GREENSTEAD, ESSEX, BUILT IN ELEVENTH CENTURY.

ly to the prevailing fashion, and already in his reign it seemed as if England was conquered by her neighbours.

Edward's keenest ambition was concerned with the prevalent fashion of church-building, and he embarked upon a great project. It is said that he had planned a pilgrimage to Rome, but that the insular prejudices of his people kept him from leaving their shores, and, since he might not visit the tomb of the martyr St. Peter, he determined to rear in England a stately shrine in his honour. For the purpose he set aside one-tenth of the royal revenues, and during more than half of his reign his darling object of interest was the building of "the Collegiate Church of St. Peter," better known as Westminster Abbey. It was a vast structure in the Norman style, far surpassing anything in England, which still had many wooden churches. The first Westminster Abbey, of which few traces remain at the present day, was in fact the noblest monument of the early dominance of Norman ideas in England.

The vigorous insular life which England had developed was not without its champions against Norman influence. Canute had among his chief English advisers Godwin, who as Earl of Wessex became a rich and powerful noble, and the chief domestic interest of the reign of Edward is in the struggle of Godwin and his family to control the affairs of England. Perhaps to secure the powerful earl's support, Edward, upon coming to the throne, married his daughter Edith. But the king's relations with the family were at first not happy. His brother Alfred was murdered in 1036. Stories were told, and even open accusation was made, that Godwin had been concerned in the murder, and a formal acquittal seems never to have removed from Edward's mind suspicions which were probably well founded. Godwin was ambitious for his family of six sons and three daughters, and sought for them high office. England was still divided into the semi-independent earldoms, ruled by the king's nominees, and so great was the influence of Godwin that at one time he and his sons

The influence of
the house of
Godwin.

governed almost the whole country. They watched with jealous suspicion the growth of Norman influence. In 1051 the arrogance of Eustace of Boulogne, the king's brother-in-law and a foreigner, in seeking lawlessly to quarter his French followers in English houses at Dover, caused a riot in which many were slain on both sides. Eustace appealed to his kinsman Edward, who ordered Godwin summarily to chastise the Dover townsmen. The earl demanded that there should be first a fair trial, and Edward, bitterly resentful at this check upon his will, called out his forces, and Godwin also took up arms. For the moment Godwin's cause failed; he was outlawed and fled with his sons from England. But before the end of the year they returned, and Edward was obliged to make terms. Foreign influence was from that day checked, and Godwin's family was supreme.

When Godwin died in 1053, his second and ablest son, Harold, succeeded him as Earl of Wessex, and attained a supreme position in England, which he lost only with his life on the fatal field of Hastings. We know little of his character, but his deeds show him to have been a strong man and a skilful soldier. By 1065 the great abbey was nearing completion, and during the Christmas festivities of that year it was consecrated with elaborate ceremonial. But the king, who had made its building the chief purpose of his life, was now near his end and too weak to take part in the joyous festivities. He died on Thursday, January 5, 1066. The event brought a political crisis in England. Edward left no direct heir, and Harold grasped the kingship before any rival could check him. He buried Edward hurriedly in the great minster on the day after death, and on that day, in the same place, he himself was anointed and crowned King of England. Probably all necessary legal forms were complied with. No doubt Harold was formally chosen by the Witan or Great Council, which

Harold becomes practically ruler of England, and in 1066 king.


claimed the right to name the king; no doubt the applause of the populace approved the choice; but the extreme haste was in itself suspicious, and that Harold must hold by the sword the glittering prize which he had won was soon apparent.

William, Duke of Normandy, and Harold, King of England, who are now to engage in a deadly struggle for the crown, though lacking in the subtler traits of statesmanship, are still great men, rough-hewn. William, the illegitimate son

The career of
William, Duke
of Normandy.

of Robert, Duke of Normandy, and a tanner's daughter of Falaise, had succeeded, when only eight years old, to the uneasy sovereignty which his ancestor Rolf won from the King of France. He had a terrible childhood. His chief vassals thought that such a stripling could be defied, and the boy grew up amid disputes directed chiefly against his own authority. He saw some of his truest coun-

sellors basely murdered; powerful conspiracies were formed against him; his own life was attempted; territory that



THE CASTLE AT FALAISE, BIRTHPLACE OF WILLIAM THE CONQUEROR.

belonged of right to his dukedom was wrested from him. His necessities made him above everything else a warrior. He had besides great intellectual gifts, the insight of a general and statesman, and a giant's physical power; no other man could bend his bow.

The character
of William.

In anger he was rash and passionate. When the defenders at the Bridge of Alençon sneered at his tanner ancestry, he swore "by the splendour of God" that he would prune them as a tree is pruned. He took the bridge, and a shower of human hands and feet over the castle wall revealed the terrible resolution that lay behind his threat. Though ruthless and cruel, he had yet good impulses, and was chaste in life. He gave wise rulers to the Church, was fond of the Scriptures, and tried, apparently in vain, to learn to read them for himself. His nobles he did not allow to imitate what was sometimes the mad injustice of his own rule, and they found in him a will and purpose which held them in check. When his troubled boyhood ripened into strong manhood he banished some of those who had opposed his policy; others were poisoned, it was whispered by his order. He had a masterly capacity to make even his injustice appear to serve the truth, and he never lost the support of the Church. He belonged to a conquering race. While he was struggling in Normandy, challenging his feudal lord, the King of France, and subduing Maine and a portion of Anjou, another Norman, Robert Guiscard, was laying the foundation of the great Norman kingdom of Sicily. William, too, amid his own domestic struggles, had begun to dream of acquiring a new realm. England was near; its political weakness was well understood at the Norman court, and he resolved that when Edward the Confessor died the English crown should be his.

The custom of electing kings, instead of giving them the succession by hereditary right, if carried out freely might produce good results. But in the mediæval empire

and in Poland it wrought only mischief, for the nobles who chose the king aimed always to keep him so weak that he could not coerce them. In England, kingship, in theory elective, had hitherto been in fact almost hereditary, and when Harold, a leader not of the ancient line, was chosen king, it was inevitable that some should consider him a usurper. The two brothers, Edwin and Morkere, who in Edward's reign were in charge of the northern half of the kingdom—Mercia and Northumberland—held aloof. Harold had married their sister Edith, but even with this tie he won only a sullen recognition. The Church, too, was suspicious and turned against him. He was devout, and gave lands to endow a great ecclesiastical foundation at Waltham; he made a pilgrimage to Rome in the latter years of Edward, and with pious zeal brought back relics and treasures, chiefly for this church, but none the less did he arouse ecclesiastical anger. For patriotic reasons he drove Norman bishops from England without waiting for authority from Rome, and he offended the monks (one of whom, Hildebrand, was then dominant in the Church) by favouring their rivals, the secular clergy, and installing them at Waltham. He was charged, too, with robbing the Church of her lands, and an even worse crime was alleged when he, like his father, was said to have been a party to the murder of the sainted Edward's brother Alfred, and it was claimed that he allowed gross ecclesiastical irregularities in England. The love of Harold and Edith Swanneschals shows that he was less pure in life than William. On the other hand, even in a time of fierce passions, he was never guilty of William's barbarity.

William, while hunting near Rouen, heard of Edward's death and of Harold's accession. He turned homeward at once, and sat long in the great hall, his head covered with his mantle and uttering no word. When at last he

The difficulties
of Harold as
elected king.
The Church's
antagonism.

spoke it was to say that he sorrowed not only for Edward's death, but for the falsity of Harold. This re-

The claim of William of Normandy to the English throne. veals his policy; he now claimed to be the rightful heir to England. Some time before he had visited England, and the childless

king then promised to bequeath the throne to his Norman cousin. At a later time Harold, it is said, was shipwrecked upon the Norman coast and became practically William's prisoner. But every attention was paid him, and William, by promising his daughter in marriage to Harold, finally secured his oath to support the Norman claim to the English crown. If Edward promised the crown to William, it is certain that he had no right to do so; it is equally certain that he revoked any such promise on his deathbed when he designated Harold as his successor. If Harold took the alleged oath to William, he did it under compulsion, and his oath could not in any case bind the English Witan in choosing a king. Yet to an uncritical age Edward's promise and Harold's oath seemed of great import, and William used them skilfully. He appealed to Rome against the perjured Harold. The appeal was heard by willing ears, and the Pope urged William to crusade against a usurper. William asked aid from his feudal lord, the King of France, whom he found not anxious to see a warlike vassal grow stronger by further conquest; he invited Christian Europe to join a holy cause, and carried on the work of preparation with resourceful energy. Volunteers flocked to the holy standard which the Pope sent, and by August, 1066, hundreds of open boats were collected at Dover to carry to England William's large force, numbering possibly from 20,000 to 30,000 men.

William had no following in England, and the obstacles were great, since his Norman vassals were not obliged to fight for him in such a cause. But he offered the hope of the rich booty of England, and Harold's difficulties

were even greater. The loyalty of the northern half of his kingdom was doubtful, and disunion, which in an

The double
attack on
England from
Norway and
from Normandy.

earlier age had made Britain a prey to the Roman, now threatened to clear the path of the Norman. The dangers multiplied.

Harold's brother Tostig had been Earl of Northumberland, but his misrule caused revolt, and Harold had dismissed and banished him. He revenged himself by ravaging the coasts of England during the summer of 1066, and by trying to arouse Scotland against England. Finally, he found in Norway a willing and powerful ally. Harold Hardrada, who then ruled Norway, is the last of the great Vikings. Driven

from home in his youth, he made his way to Russia, and finally to Constantinople, and in the service of the Greek



ENGLISH AXEMAN, 1066.

The spots indicate armour.



ENGLISH HORSEMAN.

Note the huge shield and the absence of armour, which, though not unknown in England, was less used than in Normandy.

Emperor became a renowned warrior, and received the command of the emperor's body-guard, which was then recruited from Norway, as it was later from England. In Seythia, Greece, and Sicily he performed brilliant feats. Ultimately he found

his way back to Norway, became king, and spent the early years of his reign in war with Sweyn of Denmark. In

1064, when they made a treaty of peace. Harold's restless spirit craved for some new enterprise, and two years later Tostig's appeal found a ready listener.

The force preparing in Norway, in the summer of 1066, for the invasion of England was only less formidable than that of William of Normandy. Northmen had before conquered and ruled

Harold Hardrada's invasion of England.


in England, and Harold Hardrada thought the same splendid prize within his reach. Of numbers in this age we know little, but Harold Hardrada ruled despotically, the resources of Norway were his, and he could collect many followers for such an enterprise. It does not appear that he and William acted in concert; they were indeed rivals for the same booty, but Tostig was the friend of both. While William's boats were lying at Dive, Harold's great force gathered near Bergen. The wind that held William prisoner released Harold, and early in September the North Sea was dotted with the boats of still another expedition of the hardy Norsemen against the shores of England. The invading fleet gathered in the Tyne and began a terrible ravaging of the coast. Finally they sailed up the Humber, landed at Riccall, and marched on York, the northern capital.



ENGLISH SPEARMEN.

Harold of England was in the south. He had spent the summer in the Isle of Wight organizing the coast defences against William. Both an army and a fleet were needed, and Harold had neither. His own body-guard—the House Carls—was the fine nucleus of a regular army,

but it was small. He called out the militia known as the "fyrd," and during the summer the coast, where it was thought William might land, was carefully guarded. But William did not come. The English force was inactive, and Harold found great difficulty in keeping it together, for food was scarce, and the men were besides needed at home to gather the ripening harvest. It should seem as if Harold, brave and efficient in actual conflict, lacked foresight: he did not watch William's movements closely; the unseen danger was apparently half forgotten, and on September 8 he dissolved the special levies. The peasants went to their homes, and the king himself to London, whither also he summoned his ships, and the south and the east coasts of England were left unguarded.




NORMAN WAR-VESSEL, ELEVENTH CENTURY.

The defence of the north had been left entirely to Harold's half-hearted supporters, Edwin and Morkere. At Fulford, on September 20, they met Harold Hardrada marching upon York, and were defeated with great slaughter. Four days later (on September 24) York promised to open its gates to the victor. Harold of England was ill apparently at London, when news arrived of the coming of the Nor-

The overthrow
of Harold
Hardrada and
Tostig.

wegian king. Dangers threatened on every side, but the most imminent was from the north, and Harold, with his force of House Carls, started on the long march of 300



WILLIAM THE CONQUEROR ON THE WAY TO ENGLAND.

Note the horses on board. This and some of the other pictures are from the Bayeux Tapestry, a strip of linen cloth 20 inches wide and 213 feet long, still preserved at Bayeux in France, and having upon it successive pictures of the Norman Conquest in needlework, done, it is said, by William's queen Matilda and her ladies.

miles to York. He ordered the shire levies to follow, and volunteers joined him as he went. No more brilliant exploit is recorded than the march of this harassed king. Harold Hardrada was at Stamford Bridge waiting for the surrender of promised English hostages and of York itself, when on Monday, September 25, the King of England, whose approach had been unobserved, attacked him. A desperate fight followed. Harold Hardrada, Tostig, and the flower of the Norwegian force fell, and the English won at Stamford Bridge the last of the long series of battles with the invaders from the north.

But disaster brooded over England. The favourable wind, watched and prayed for by the Normans during more than a month, at last came, and William with a great force landed at Pevensay, on the south coast, three days after the battle of Stamford Bridge. Harold, hurrying to the south, paused at London to gather additional forces and to plan a new

The landing
of William in
England.

campaign. Some advised him to shut himself up in London and to starve out the Norman by ravaging the whole



NORMAN ARCHER, 1066.

This short-bow was much less formidable than the long-bow of a later age.

south country, but he refused thus to harass his own people. William was at Hastings, and his army engaged in systematic pillage and destruction. On October 12 Harold marched out of London to meet him, and on the 13th he took up his position on rising ground, known later as the Hill of Senlac, seven miles from Hastings, where now stands the town of Battle. The position was skilfully chosen. The English army apparently intrenched itself on high ground, and the attacking force had to surmount both the hill and these intrenchments. Harold surrounded himself in the centre with

his own trained House Carls, and the undisciplined force on his two wings had, like the centre, the advantage of cover, which they were ordered not to leave.

The battle of Hastings, so momentous in English history, gave little occasion for the complicated tactics of later warfare. Harold was in a strong position, and William attempted to seize it, mainly by hand-to-hand



BATTLE OF HASTINGS.

fighting. Undoubtedly the Normans were the better armed and disciplined. The battle began at nine in the

morning, and the monkish chroniclers, to whom Harold was a perjured outcast and who regarded even his victory


The battle
of Hastings,
or Senlac,
Oct. 14, 1066.

at Stamford
Bridge as un-
holy fratri-
cide, loved to

repeat the story that the Norman host had passed the previous night in solemn devotion, the English in revelling. When William learned where Harold's standard stood, he vowed if successful to

build on the spot a great minster. For six long hours the Normans attacked in vain. But when the English drove back and unwisely pursued the Norman left wing, William at last saw his chance. The left wing recovered itself,

but he ordered it again to fly, and when the English right pursued, the Norman centre rushed to occupy their position. The assailants were now on the height, and as night fell they closed in upon Harold. No quarter was asked or given, and the English king, his two brothers Gyrth and Leofwine, and almost the whole of the English nobility, fell fighting round the English standard. That night, amid the corpses and the wounded and dying, William feasted, and he slept on the spot where afterward rose the high altar of Battle Abbey.



NORMAN HORSEMAN, 1066.



NORMAN KNIGHT, 1066.

Harold was dead and the English were without a leader. To this is probably due the complete paralysis of English military action after the battle

of Hastings. Dover, Canterbury, and Winchester surrendered. William marched toward London, burned Southwark on the right bank of the Thames, crossed the river farther up at Wallingford, and occupied a strong position at Berkhamstead. The south was his, and now he could cut off London from the north. The English Witan meanwhile chose Edgar Atheling, grandson of Edmund Ironside, to succeed Harold, but he was a mere boy and was, apparently, never crowned. The losers at Hastings began to remember that they had been happy under one foreign king from the north, Canute, and two months after the great battle a deputation from London, which included even Edgar Atheling himself, offered the crown to William. He accepted it, and on Christmas day, 1066,




BATTLE ABBEY.

Built on the site of Harold's fall.

William, Duke of Normandy, was lawfully chosen and crowned King of England. A solemn service was held in Westminster Abbey. At its most important point the

ringing English shout of acceptance of the new king frightened his Norman followers, who thought it a signal of riot. The precincts of the Abbey were set on fire and



the crowd rushed out, leaving only the king and the clergy before the altar. In turmoil and bloodshed began William's lawful reign, and in them it was to continue till no one dared to raise a hand against him.

BOOKS FOR REFERENCE

* Green, *The Making of England (449-829)*, (2 vols., 1897); * Green, *The Conquest of England (829-1071)*, (2 vols., 1899); Conybeare, *Alfred in the Chronicles* (1900), (mainly extracts from *Chronicles*); Freeman, *The Norman Conquest* (6 vols., 1867-'79); Ramsay, *The Foundations of England* (2 vols., 1898).

CHAPTER V

Pre-Norman Civilization in England

UNDER Roman rule Britain had become a highly civilized land, with an extensive trade. But the English conqueror who succeeded Rome cared nothing for the trade, and it was completely ruined. For the cultivation of the soil he did care; it remained for centuries almost his sole industry. Apparently in some districts the Englishman stepped into the place of the former Roman master, made

The nature of the early communities of the English.



CARTS, ELEVENTH CENTURY.

Note the goad, instead of a whip, and the smallness of the cattle of the time.

slaves of the conquered people, and forced them to till the soil, while in others the Briton disappeared, perhaps wholly, and the English founded village communities of their own race, on the model of their German home. These communities were very small, containing rarely more than a dozen freemen, and sometimes only the members of a single family; Wellington was the "ton" or defensive mound of the Wellings; the Ashings, the Wokings, and others dwelt in "hams" or villages called by their names (Ashingham, Wokingham). Each freeman

had his own cottage with its little plot of ground, but the farm-land was divided into strips in great open fields, and a reallotment of these strips was made from time to time. The wood and pasture land was also held in common, and the right to cut fuel and to pasture animals was determined on a definite scale.

Details are little known to us, and we shall probably never be able to say when this free community became a manor, and the lord of the manor began to play his part as master in English village life.


The manor. From the first, the earl, or man of noble birth, is distinguished from the churl, or man without rank. The power and influence of a

ruling class appear to have grown steadily, and little of the old English liberties endured to the Norman Conquest. By that time great land-owners held in subjection the villagers,

most of whom had become "villeins" (the people of the "vill"), who paid rent, in labour and in kind, for their holdings, and were under the authority of their lord. Besides the villeins, there were slaves, who were the mere chattels of their master, and whose ranks were recruited mainly from among the captives taken in war. The old village organization may long have remained, as it has remained in Russia to our own day, with its regular reallotment of land, but any real liberty in the villages appears to have died out early. The English


The buildings in the village.

village, it must be admitted, was a squalid little community, with a very meagre social development. Its houses were of wood, sometimes even of wattled branches, with thatched roofs. They were



PLOUGHING, ELEVENTH CENTURY.

ranged near each other along the village street, or they clustered round the fortified house of the lord, which was often not a castle in the proper sense of the word, but a simple wooden structure surrounded by earthworks



AGRICULTURE, ELEVENTH CENTURY.

Note the implements.

and a palisade. Even the village church was usually of wood. Though the Roman built in Britain massive stone churches, a few of which still remain, his English successor did not know at first how to use this material, and when Benedict Biscop, about 700 A. D., built a stone church at Wearmouth, he was obliged to seek workmen from the Continent.

The conditions of life in the village were not, as a rule, wholesome. The village street was choked with filth and dirt, and the neglect of sanitation brought the inevitable result that repeated plague desolated the country—the same “Black Death” which wrought such havoc in the fourteenth century. In one of the early visitations, two out of three of the population of Ireland are said to have perished, and such deso-

Unwholesome
conditions in
the village.

lation overtook the monastery at Jarrow in the eighth century that only the abbot and a little boy were left to chant the services. Medicine and surgery were practically

Self-contained unknown. The village was a self-contained character of the unit. The farms supplied food, the forest village. fuel, the housewife spun the needed cloth,

and from the outer world little was required but salt, iron for implements, and mill-stones to grind the corn. The village was served by the carpenter and the smith, who in return received their share of the land and its produce.

In the early period the visit of a stranger was rare, but in time, peddlers, with the few commodities which the villagers could buy, went about on foot from place to place, as did the wandering minstrel or mountebank. The villager himself stayed at home, ignorant and unprogressive. The English had not known in their northern home the life of the town, and for many generations they left un-

Meagre foreign tenanted the Roman towns in Britain. With trade of the the towns disappeared the commerce of which early English. they were the symbol. No longer was a fleet

of ships necessary to carry to Continental ports the products of the field and of the mine, and the foreign trade of the English, in at least their earlier years, narrowed down to the one chief commodity of slaves—captives in war and those seized for crime or debt. The older commerce revived as years went on, but down to the Norman Conquest it was still slight.

In this early England there was a rude plenty. Great numbers of swine fed in the forests upon acorns and nuts; there were herds of many cattle and great flocks of sheep, and apparently even the lower classes were meat-eaters, for the Church threatens



WORKMAN,
ELEVENTH CENTURY.

with penalties masters who give their servants meat on fast-days, like Friday. Fish was abundant on the coasts,

The food of
the English.

but, owing to the difficulty of transportation, not in the interior. The peasants' diet must have been mainly of rudely cooked pork or other meat, and of a black bread made of barley and oats. Potatoes were of course unknown; cabbage was the chief



DRINKING AND MUSIC.

Note the musical instruments, the dancing, and the one eup for the guests.

vegetable. Mead (fermented honey) and also malt ale were common; wheaten bread, wine, and other luxuries must have been confined mainly to the well-to-do. Tea, coffee, and tobacco, which in modern times have become almost necessities of life, had not yet reached Europe.

Various phases of culture matured in the long period between the English and the Norman Conquests, and

A scene of
festivity in
early England.

what is true of one century need not be wholly true of another. Yet daily habits appear to have varied little. The great man was accustomed to dine with his family, guests, and dependents in the large high-roofed hall of his rude dwelling. In cold weather a fire blazed in the centre of the hall, and the smoke escaped through a hole in the roof. No plates or forks were on the table. Meat was taken in the fingers from huge dishes; sometimes it was cut up with the knife carried in the belt; more often, perhaps, it was torn in pieces with the teeth. Glasses and silver, and even gold cups, were common, for in the midst of much that is plain

we are often surprised at some evidence of wealth or luxury. The lady of the house served the guests at the feast with drink and then sat down at her lord's side, and she and the others of her sex retired to their own chambers before the more boisterous festivities began. These often developed into scenes of drunkenness and strife. Minstrels, story-tellers, jugglers, and jesters sometimes amused the company. Since a manor-house contained but one or two small sleeping apartments it could furnish but rude accommodation to visitors; and when at last the lord retired the principal guests would lie down to sleep usually on the rush-strewn floor of the hall, with their feet to the fire and their arms near at hand, while dependents of humbler rank shivered in places remoter from the central warmth.

Of the dress of the period our knowledge is scanty. The women wove beautiful linen and of it made long tunics, worn like a petticoat, over which was

Dress.

the gown, often richly embroidered, falling to the knee. Both men and women favoured bright colours, and wore the hair long; cropped hair was the sign of the slave. The ordinary head-dress of a woman was a long cloth (the wimple), wound round the neck and over the head in the fashion of the nun's dress



GENTLEMAN AND LADY, TENTH CENTURY.

Note especially the man's costume.

of modern times; over this the wearer, when going out, drew a hood. The dress of men was simple, yet in some

respects more elaborate than it is now, for they wore gold and silver bracelets, chains and brooches. Their tunics, often rich in texture and colour, were caught in at the waist by a belt, in which was carried a knife, with a sheath sometimes jewelled. Long tight-fitting stockings of some woven material covered the legs. We do not know what underclothing was worn, but its texture was coarse. The variety of the material of dress was much the same as in modern times, except that silk was rare, cotton was not used, and men sometimes wore clothes of leather. Shoes of this material were worn by all classes.

The early English dwelling was rudely planned, and provided but meagre comfort in the sense which modern luxury implies. There was little to aid the repose of the body or to please the eye. Furniture was so scanty that the king sometimes carried with him, from place to place, what was necessary. In the hall the dining-table was usually of boards placed on movable trestles, and wooden benches served as seats. The doorways and walls were sometimes hung with tapestries that served the useful purpose of protection from draughts. The narrow windows were either unprotected openings or were filled with oiled linen, rarely in the earlier period with glass, to keep out the cold and let in the light. The beds, mere bags of straw, lay often on the floor, but bedsteads were sometimes used; bedclothes in the modern sense were little used; the sleeper wore the clothing of the day, or lay in bed naked, drawing over him a rug made of the skin of some animal. Personal cleanliness was far below the modern standard, though the English had learned to use hot baths, more perhaps for enjoyment than for purifying the body.

The art of embroidery in gold reached a high development in early England, as did that of illuminating manuscripts, carried on mainly by the monks in the monasteries; both are due to a society not pressed for time. The

heavy work of the fields was shared by the women of the lower classes, and they must in consequence have given

but scant attention to their wretched hovels.

Industry and
amusements.

Ladies, in addition to domestic duties, busied themselves with tapestry and embroidery.

There was little to read besides the manuscript manuals of devotion. For amusement, chess, backgammon, and similar games were not unknown, but playing-cards were a later invention. There was much singing of a rude kind, often by wandering gleemen and musicians. Hunting and horse-racing were familiar to early England, and gambling, excessive drinking, and fighting were common in a society that had few of the refinements of modern life.

Education, wholly in the hands of the Church, consisted of the simplest elements as taught at the present

Education
and literature.

day, with much attention to music, as aiding the Church services. Few of the village children went to school; among at least the

lower classes only those intended for the clerical profession learned to read. Yet England was not without its literature. At the feasts even the humblest sometimes took their turn to sing, to chant verses, or to play the harp. In Northumbria the deeds of Beowulf, a hero of the first home of the English in northern Europe, were sung as early as in the sixth century, and the metrical tale passed in time from one end of the land to the other; by the tenth century it had become the great English epic poem, still preserved under the name of Beowulf. Caedmon, a simple cowherd in the days when Theodore was organizing the forces of the English Church (about 675), would steal away in shame from the feast to the cattle-shed, because his own verses and song were so rude that he shrank from taking his part with others. Once, the story goes, he was bidden in a dream to sing of holy things, and henceforth he put not his own thoughts but the story of the Gospel into lyric verse, and sang so beautifully that

he acquired the fame of a great poet. It was in Latin that Bede wrote the early history of England, but Latin was spoken only by the few, and Alfred, perhaps the noblest king in history, to teach his people turned Bede's writing and other important works into the English tongue. When this was done, sober English prose had come to stand side by side with the works of the makers of verse. The old English both of "Beowulf" and of Alfred is to us a strange tongue. Not the less is modern English derived from these sources.

The English had no written laws at their arrival, and they borrowed nothing from Rome; it is doubtful if for five hundred years after their coming a single Roman law-book was to be found among them.

The early laws
of the English.

They followed unwritten tribal customs, and showed already the reverence for precedent which has played such a part in English political life. Ethelbert of Kent, who welcomed Augustine to England, was a contemporary of the great Justinian, the reorganizer of the Roman law. Perhaps inspired by some ambi-

The first
written laws.


tion to imitate the Roman legislator, Ethelbert wrote down the simple laws of his people. Later additions are included in his legal system as it has come to us, and yet it contains only ninety brief sentences. There is much about the Church and her property, but the laws are mainly directed against deeds of violence; for striking another on the nose with the fist the fine is 3 shillings; for putting out an eye it is 50 shillings, and so on. After Ethelbert, the chief legislators of early England are Ine, the king of the West Saxons at the end of the seventh century, and his great descendant Alfred, at the end of the ninth. Both added to the written body of laws, and those of England of the present day are the direct outcome of the work of these early kings.

English law, like other northern legal systems, has the custom of the wergeld. In a rude society the killing of a man was apt to provoke indiscriminate revenge by his family. To check this a money value was set upon the life of the members of each class in the state, the prince's and the priest's life ranking highest, and any one slaying another unlawfully was required to pay to the dead man's family this "wergeld." But if the offender should fail to pay, the relatives were then allowed to wreak their own vengeance; they reverted, in fact, to the old barbaric method.

The government of early England was, of course, without the cohesion and the strength of a later age. The village fathers were jointly responsible for the cultivation of the land, and wherever free communities were established they held meetings to arrange their affairs. In time the state made them responsible for each other's good conduct and for the collection of taxes. Eight or ten villages were joined to form what was called the "hundred," probably because it represented a hundred heads of families. There was a "hundred-moot," or meeting, at

The custom of the "wergeld."


The union of villages into "hundreds" and the work of the "hundred-moot."



SCOURGING A SLAVE.

least several times in the year. To it came the reeve and other chief men from the villages, and upon those gathered together appears at first to have been laid the

burden of preserving order in the district and of settling disputes. The evildoers were arraigned before them, and to them the wronged man appealed. Justice was rude.



OLD ENGLISH GALLOWES.

If the accused man denied his guilt, he must swear that he was innocent and find twelve other men in the community to swear that they believed him. By this method of "compurgation" he was acquitted. But should he fail to secure "compurgators," he must go through the ordeal—plunge his arm into boiling water, or walk blindfold over red-hot plough-shares, and be able to show at the end of a fixed number of days that he had received no harm. On such terms few, if any, could be proved innocent. No doubt, however, most of those accused either admitted guilt or found compurgators to declare their innocence.

There was a still larger union than the hundred—that of the whole tribe, at first inhabiting an area about equal to the modern county, but soon, by union, conquest, and absorption, extending until all England was divided up, first into the traditional number of seven kingdoms (the Heptarchy), and at last united under a single king. The English carried on a long contest with a stubborn foe, and needed above everything effective leaders. While dwellers in Germany they appear to have had no kings; but in England the chosen leader in the prolonged war became at length the permanent ruler, with the title of king, which implies that he is chief of the kin or tribe. When a vacancy occurred the fittest man among the members of the royal house was chosen king. From time to time the king summoned his people to meet to decide important issues, and then the reeve and other

The meeting of
the people in the
"folkmoot."
The kingship.

leading men from the villages made their way, fully armed, to the assembly, called the "folk moot," or meeting of the whole people. They debated weighty matters, especially questions of war and peace, and the discussions were accompanied by the approving clash of the warriors' arms upon their shields. These first English parliaments were, above all, councils of war, in which armed men decided the questions.

The king's power tended to increase, that of the people to decline. As the political divisions grew in size the villagers found themselves too poor, oppressed, or remote to send their chief men to the folk moot, and the affairs of the central government passed wholly into the hands of the king and his friends. In time all ceased to

attend the national meeting but such leaders in the counties as the bishop, the alderman or headman of the shire, the abbots of the chief monasteries, and other magnates. These, with the king's nominees, formed the Witenagemot—the meeting of wise men. More and more the royal court became the centre of social and political life. Surrounding the king were his thanes (a word meaning servants)—a chosen war-band, devoted to his personal service, and ready, if need be, to give their lives for him; if the king died in battle,

it was disgraceful for the thane to survive. These friends and counsellors became the nobles about the throne. Apparently at first the Church alone received from the king lordship over large areas of land; but in time lay lords also secured similar rights and authority, and all the villages had in time masters who, though often cruel and oppressive, gave, on the other hand, the protection required in a rude age. The villager still attended the court of the village or manor and of the hundred, and had some voice in at least local, though no longer in national, affairs.

Growth of the power of the king and of the chief men in the "witenagemot."

The king's friends.

In a dim way, these are some features of old English life. There was little real union among those nominally the subjects of the same king; Northumbria, remote from Wessex, preserved a feudal independence almost complete; patriotism was local and not national, and Englishmen had not learned to stand together against the common foe. Internal division aided the Norman assailant, and to him, as booty, fell the state for which Alfred had toiled. What England, left to herself, would have become, who can say? Her spirit was quickened by the wider culture of the new masters; apparent disaster then, as so often in human affairs, concealed a deeper good.

Lack of unity in early England.

SUMMARY OF DATES TO 1066

The Invasion of Julius Cæsar in 55 and 54 B.C. is the first precise date. The Roman Conquest, which began in A.D. 43, is even more important. Boadicea's Rebellion occurred in 61. Between 78 and 85 Agricola firmly established the Roman power, which lasted until 410. The First English Settlement was made in Kent, probably in 449, and the Battle of Deorham in 577, more than a century later, made certain final English victory. The next important phase of the history is found in Christian missionary work. St. Patrick was preaching in Ireland about 432, and Columba went to Iona in 563, thirty-four years before Augustine landed in Kent in 597. The Council of Whitby was in 664.

The rivalries among the English conquerors for supremacy are very intricate. Penda of Mercia was the champion of paganism until overthrown and killed in 655. Ine, King of Wessex (688-726), and Offa, King of Mercia (757-796), were lawgivers, and under the latter, in 787, the Northmen began their inroads. Egbert (802-839) was King of Wessex, but made himself supreme over practically all England, and henceforth Wessex takes the lead. Alfred the Great (871-901) made the Treaty of Wedmore in 878. The Danes were supreme in England from 1016 to 1042, when began the reign of Edward the Confessor. Harold, his successor, was killed at Hastings in 1066, when William the Norman became king.

BOOKS FOR REFERENCE

Maitland, *Domesday Book and Beyond: Three Essays on the Early History of England* (1897); Seebohm, *The English Village Community* (1890); Andrews, *The Old English Manor* (1892); *Ashley, *An Introduction to English Economic History and Theory* (2 vols., 1893-'94); *Cunningham, *The Growth of English Industry and Commerce* (2 vols., 1892-'96); *Wright, *The Homes of Other Days: a History of Domestic Manners* (1871).

CHAPTER VI

From the Beginning of Foreign Rule under William the Conqueror to the Reforming Era of Henry II¹


(1066 to 1189—123 years)

William I	born 1027?	succeeded 1066;	died 1087.
William II	" 1060?	" 1087;	" 1100.
Henry I	" 1068;	" 1100;	" 1135.
Stephen	" 1094?	" 1135;	" 1154.
Henry II	" 1133;	" 1154;	" 1189.

[At the beginning of the period there was a bitter conflict for supreme authority between the popes and the emperors. Pope Gregory VII (Hildebrand) attacked abuses in the Church—clerical marriage, the sale of spiritual offices (simony), and, especially, lay investiture, the practice by which secular rulers conferred upon ecclesiastics not only their estates but also the symbols of their spiritual power, the pastoral staff and the ring. Gregory claimed that the corruptions in the Church were largely due to the control which laymen exercised in this way, and forbade lay investiture. He excommunicated the Emperor Henry IV for opposition to his policy and Henry was obliged to stand in the garb of a penitent for three days in the snow-covered

¹THE NORMAN KINGS OF ENGLAND

WILLIAM THE CONQUEROR = Matilda of Flanders,
1066-1087.



court of the Castle of Canossa begging admission to Gregory's presence in order to secure absolution. Henceforth the Church could claim that the empire had prostrated itself before her. Soon began the crusades to rescue the Holy Land from the Turks, and these strengthened the power of the Church, for the Popes, aided by such preachers as Peter the Hermit and Bernard of Clairvaux, led in the movement. The Church received the vows of the Crusaders, and held them to, or, on her own terms, released them from, such vows. From 1095 the crusading fever lasted in Europe through the whole of the period.]

THE Norman Conquest was no accident which might easily have been averted. It is true that the English had more advanced laws and literature, and perhaps a better social order, than had William's anarchic duchy. But the invaders were the stronger race; they were more hardy, intelligent, thrifty, and sober, and they had in addition better arms and organization. There was a long sullen struggle. Englishmen learned that for them, as against the Norman, justice did not exist. Norman ruffians might seize an Englishman's property or carry off his wife, but the conquered race could get no redress, and revolt soon came. But, as of old, the English were not united. The heart of the revolt in the southwest died out when, in 1068, William took Exeter, the rebel stronghold. He had more serious work in the north, where Sweyn of Denmark gave help to the English earls, Edwin and Morkere. William went north to meet them; at his order Norman castles sprang up everywhere and the revolt seemed crushed, but his return to the south was followed by a second and even a third rising, which finally aroused his terrible resentment. Of the many pages of history stained with blood, none is worse than that which tells of his harrying of Northumberland. In the sixty miles from York to Durham he destroyed men, women, and children, towns and villages, including even the churches, and years after, when he lay dying, these scenes in North-

The superiority
of the Normans
to the English.


The English
revolts, 1067-
1071.

umberland rose to torture his conscience. He crossed England in the depth of winter to Chester, contemptuously dismissing those of his followers who murmured at the horrors of the way. Chester fell, and the terror reached the heart of his foes on the Welsh border. A little later the last spark of English revolt died out when William built a causeway across the marshes and took Ely, in the fen country. Then even Hereward, the bravest of the English leaders, entered his service, and Edgar Atheling became a dependent at this court. William's arm reached beyond England. Malcolm Canmore, King of Scotland, married Edgar Atheling's sister Margaret, one of the few queen-saints in the Roman calendar, and Malcolm's court became a refuge for the English. William marched into Scotland, and in a short campaign forced Malcolm to acknowledge himself the vassal of the King of England. He had designs upon Ireland too, but they were never carried out.

William, though cruel and ruthless, was yet no lawless tyrant. He had indeed a passion for order, and his claim to be the lawful successor of Edward the Confessor made him the champion of the English system. Many of the old landowners of England perished with Harold; opponents of William who survived forfeited their lands, and the frequent revolts increased the forfeitures. To about 20,000 Normans, some noble by birth, some raised from the menial posts of cooks or gamekeepers to be masters of the English, William granted the greater part of the land. In law and custom it was the England of old, but all political power was in the hands of a new and foreign territorial aristocracy. So also was ecclesiastical power. Stigand, the English Archbishop of Canterbury, was replaced by William's Archbishop Lanfranc, and the change from English to Norman barons and prelates was so com-

William's
invasion of
Scotland, 1072.

William's sys-
tem, English
law and Norman
supremacy.



THE TOWER OF LONDON AS IT APPEARED IN 1760.

The square keep (the White Tower) with the four turrets was built by William the Conqueror in 1078 on the site of an older castle.

plete that not an English earl, and but one English bishop, was left at the close of the reign.

Though in the old England the Church enjoyed special privileges, her jurisdiction was not sharply marked off from that of the state. But Lanfranc had been trained in the continental view that the Church should rule her own domain under her own laws, and this she now began to do in England. Bishops and clergy were no

William permits to the Church a separate system of law in England.

longer responsible for their conduct to the courts before which the king's other subjects appeared. Charges against them and matters in which spiritual interests played an important part, such as oaths, marriages, bequests, perjury, and heresy, passed under the jurisdiction of new ecclesiastical courts, and the Church and the state henceforth represent distinct systems, often at war. William's bishops were usually good men. To increase their influence Lanfranc removed their seats from obscure villages to the important towns, and William found that he could sometimes use the Norman bishop to check the violence of the Norman baron. Moral reform was in the air, for Hildebrand ruled at Rome, and England, like other states, felt the influence of his unbending energy. Lanfranc summoned the clergy to councils presided over by himself and he gave the Church unity and vigour. Her liberties alone William did not crush, yet when the Pope asked him to admit that he held England as the Church's vassal, he sternly refused, and insisted that without his consent no Pope should be recognised in England, no synod held, no papal letters received, no canons enacted, no subject excommunicated, and he kept always a firm rein upon the clergy.

Of William's rule the chief surviving record is the great survey known as Domesday Book. He had granted lands with a free hand: Robert of Mortain, his brother, had 793 manors scattered over 20 counties; Odo, Bishop

of Bayeux, had 439 manors in 17 counties; William himself retained more than a thousand manors. The time came when, with his instinct for order, he desired to know exactly what land his subjects held, whether their title was good, and what taxes they could pay. He sent commissioners from shire to shire, and nothing escaped them; they noted every house, every acre of wood, meadow, and pasture-land, every mill, every fish-pond. Not only human beings, but horses, cows, pigs, sheep, even bee-hives, found place in the relentless roll. The commissioners examined both masters and their villeins on oath; sometimes the insistence of the inquiry caused bloodshed, but most of the work was done within a year, and its parchment record still exists, the most treasured of English public documents. It enrolls the names of those who had established their right to land by grant from William, and Normans and Englishmen alike found no favour if their title was defective.

One thing more was needed to complete William's structure of government. The curse of the older England had been disunion, caused by the too great independence of earls who ruled whole provinces, and in Normandy, also, William's nobles waged war against each other, and claimed completely independent sovereignty over their vassals. He determined to crush such evils in his new realm. Probably by an accident of the Conquest, his great feudatories had their estates scattered over the whole kingdom and could not concentrate their forces. When they rebelled in 1075, William checked them easily, and after the great survey was completed he summoned the landholders to meet him on Salisbury Plain. Many thousands gathered there, and from every one he required, as supreme over all other duties, a direct oath of allegiance to himself. Further to strengthen his authority, he summoned the

The Domesday Book, 1086.

The great court at Salisbury, 1086.

barons three times in the year to attendance at his court, and made himself the one all-embracing power in the land: a baron could not even build a castle without his license.

William's later years were gloomy. His eldest son, Robert, who had no share in the spoils of England, demanded Normandy during his father's life-time. William refused, and in the struggle that followed, the rebellious son (at Gerberoi) almost killed his father. William's beloved queen died in 1083, and the lonely man was not softened by his sorrow. He put down savagely a slight revolt in the north

The last days of
the Conqueror.



WILLIAM THE CONQUEROR.

From his great seal.

of England, led by his half-brother, Odo, Bishop of Bayeux. The district known as the Vexin had belonged to the Norman dukes, but in William's youth the King of France seized it and made it the basis of inroads upon Norman territory. When William felt himself strong enough he demanded the Vexin back. As he lay at Rouen, undergoing treatment for his unwieldy corpulence, a brutal sneer of the French king was re-

ported to him. His wrath burst forth. He marched into the Vexin at harvest-time, destroyed the grain as it stood in the fields, and took and burned Mantes, the capital; even recluses in their cells perished. But as he rode through the ruined town his horse stumbled over burning embers, and he received a mortal injury. His mind was clear to the last. He had been always sincerely religious, and now with the deep sense of sin, which is so

profound a trait of his age, he saw and acknowledged the evil of his life. He ordered Mantes to be rebuilt from his immense hoards, bequeathed gifts to God in penance for the bloodshed he had caused in England, and admitted that he had no rightful claim to its crown. When a king died in those days law and order died too, until a new king established his authority. William's attendants stripped his body almost naked, seized what they could, and rushed away to guard their own interests. The dead Conqueror was carried to Caen for burial. In the midst of the funeral service one Asceline claimed that William had robbed him of the land in which the interment was to take place, and the service stopped until the claim was settled. The incidents are characteristic of the age. Everywhere we meet violence, but we meet, too, the constraining power of a religion that has real terrors for the sinful.

The Conqueror, though not presuming formally to name a successor, dictated from his deathbed a letter to Lanfranc favouring William, his second surviving son. William hurried to England with this letter, and it was really Lanfranc who made him king. He was crowned in Westminster Abbey on September 26, 1087, apparently with no other formal sanction than that of the archbishop—a striking evidence of the power of the Church and of the weakness of national life. William had no hereditary title, for his elder brother Robert was alive and claimed to be the lawful heir.

William Rufus
made king by
the influence of
the Church.

William Rufus has been condemned by posterity with more than usual vehemence. Yet he was a good son, and though himself without Christian faith he spent his treasure in masses for his father's soul. He had something of his father's vigour and impulsive daring. In almost the last year of his life, while going to hunt in

the New Forest, he heard bad news from the Continent; setting spurs to his horse, he rode alone to Southampton, sprang into the first ship he saw, a crazy old craft, and ordered the crew to put to sea. They protested that a storm was gathering. "Kings never drown," said Rufus, and the next day he was in Normandy. To some in his age he was a pattern of chivalry, but he was nevertheless a bad king. His energy was backed by no persistent determination, and he was capricious and extravagant. The strong, fat, red-faced monarch, with restless eyes and a profane and rash tongue, violated most of the decencies of his time. He remained unmarried, and was surrounded by effeminate dandies and vicious favourites.

William Rufus, like his father, found his most difficult task in holding the barons in check. He had not ruled nine months before they broke out into revolt, led again by the warlike prelate Odo, Bishop of Bayeux. They were resolved to put William's easy-going brother Robert in his place. In the peril William appealed to the English for help against their Norman oppressors. He took by storm, or starved out, the rebel strongholds, banished Odo, and was at last secure—secure, too, by the aid of the conquered nation. When strong enough, William made the barons feel his heavy hand. The chief minister of his oppres-

sions was Ranulph Flambard (the Fire-brand), ultimately Bishop of Durham. He pressed to the utmost the feudal theory of tenure, that land was held from the crown only for the holder's lifetime, and insisted that when a holder died the king might require severer conditions before regranting the land to the dead man's heir; if the heir was a minor, the king was to be his guardian until he was of age to render the required services. The king claimed, besides, the right to nominate a husband for an unmarried heiress,

The character of
William Rufus.

Struggle with
the baronage.

The oppressions
of William
Rufus.

since only a man could fulfil the conditions of feudal tenure and take up arms for the king. The holders of land suffered every extreme of tyranny. Rufus frequently sold unmarried women who were landowners to the highest bidder for their hands, pillaged the estates of minors, disregarded the wills of dead men and plundered their property. With the money thus extorted he kept up a mercenary army, which sometimes treated England as a hostile country.

Upon the Church William also waged war. While Lanfranc lived there was some check upon the king's excesses, but after that they knew no bounds.

Pillage of the
Church. An-
selm becomes
Archbishop of
Canterbury.

William kept vacant the See of Canterbury and squandered its large revenues. He sold ecclesiastical offices and made bad and unworthy men bishops and abbots. For five years

he went on unrestrained. Then, when he was stricken with what seemed a mortal illness, defiance of God melted before the terrors of death, and he consented to undo his wrongs to the Church. Anselm, Abbot of Bec, one of the purest characters of the Middle Ages, was then at the English court, and William appointed him archbishop. Anselm shrank from the office. To make him and William work together was, he said, to yoke an old and feeble sheep with a young and untamable wild bull; and the phrase shows that the head of the Church was thought to have a position in some degree on a level with the king. He tried to get away, but they dragged him from the king's bedside to the altar, and pressed the pastoral staff into his hand; in the end he became archbishop.

The Church was at the time urging that the clergy owed obedience to the Pope alone and were independent of the civil power, and when Rufus recovered he came inevitably into conflict with

William's
quarrel with
Anselm.

Anselm. Two rival popes were contending for the papal throne, and Anselm acknowledged Urban, while William declared that he himself must determine to which of the

claimants England should give allegiance. Later, he charged Anselm with not doing his duty as a feudal vassal of the crown, and at last he forced the archbishop into exile for the remainder of the reign. Already the Conqueror's policy of a Church organized apart from the state brought deadly conflict between the two.

While his energy lasted, William was a skilful soldier, but though he waged war in Normandy, he won that country not by the sword, but by the power of the purse. Robert, who secured the duchy on the death of the Conqueror, was a spend-thrift, and when seized by the crusading fever he pledged his dominions to William for the paltry sum of 10,000 marks. Normandy thus fell to William. He also conquered and held South Wales, drove back Malcolm III of Scotland when he ventured to invade England, took possession of Carlisle and the surrounding country, which had become a kind of no-man's land, and sent peasants in to colonize it. But he completed little that he undertook. He aspired to be a great builder, and extended the Conqueror's Tower of London, bridged the Thames, and built a splendid hall at Westminster, only a fragment, he said, of the huge palace he should rear. For these plans he extorted money from barons, Church, and people alike. Heavy taxes drove land out of cultivation and some of the peasantry to starvation. Bitter was the hatred of the nation for the ruthless king, whose grasp was yet too strong to shake off.

At the height of his defiant career, while hunting in the New Forest, itself in part the creation of his father's tyranny, William Rufus was stricken down. He was killed by an arrow, shot we know not by whom. Some labourers carried to Winchester the body dripping with blood. It was laid in the Cathedral, but the Church would allow no Christian rites to hallow its burial.

William extends
his dominions.

The death of
William Rufus,
1100.

Robert was still in the East, but a younger son of the Conqueror, Henry, was hunting in the New Forest on that day; he hurried to Winchester, seized the royal treasure, and won success by vigour and determination. A hasty meeting of a few magnates confirmed his title. He gained the good opinion of the Church by at once filling the See of Winchester, which Rufus had kept vacant in order to plunder its revenues, and other powerful interests were gained by promises to his support. Though Rufus died only on August 2, his successor was crowned at Westminster on the 5th, in haste that was necessary to make his authority secure, and on that day he issued a Charter of Liberties which condemned in every line the rule of Rufus, and long after became the basis of the Great Charter. Henry threw himself upon the support not only of the Normans but of the English people; he guaranteed to them the laws of Edward the Confessor as amended by the Conqueror, and married Matilda, daughter of the sainted Margaret, the English Queen of Malcolm Canmore of Scotland. The English did not fail him, and he gave them in return severe, exacting, but stable government.

Henry, like Rufus, had to restrain a hostile baronage who would have preferred Robert's slack rule. Robert, returning from the East, invaded England; but the brothers met, and Henry, for an undisputed title to England, gave up all claim to Normandy. Then he turned on the restless barons. Chief among them was Robert of Bellesme, a monster of cruelty, whose fiendish torture of men and women and children reminds us of the worst of the Italian despots of a later age. Henry fought him with the support of those of low degree, for he could trust few of the barons, and at last he drove Robert out of the country. The struggle shifted to Normandy, where Duke Robert was guilty of

Henry, a younger son of the Conqueror, secures the throne.

Henry grants a Charter of Liberties.

Henry's struggle with the baronage.

gross misrule, and where, too, he received those who fled from Henry's wrath in England. At Tenchebrai, in Normandy, in 1106, an English army under Henry met and defeated the Norman host under Robert. The conquered race might now lift up its head. Hastings was avenged; Normandy became a dependency of England, and Duke Robert spent his remaining twenty-eight years in captivity.

The Church alone still struggled for independence. Anselm was firm in asserting

Henry's quarrel
with Anselm
concerning
investiture.

her full right to control her own affairs, while Henry insisted on appointing bishops, as his father and brother had

done. He claimed, too, the old right of investing them with the pastoral staff and the ring as symbols of their spiritual authority. Anselm would not yield and was again obliged to go into exile. But a compromise was at last reached. Ecclesiastics were still to do homage to the king for their temporal possessions, but in future they were to receive from the Church alone the emblems of the spiritual office. By this agreement England was saved from the desolating War of the Investitures that troubled Germany for so many years.

There is little in Henry's reign to excite admiration, except that he gave England peace. His devout demean-

Henry's
character and
the nature of his
rule.

our and literary tastes stand in favourable contrast with the coarse bravado of his predecessor; while his lust, untruth, cruelty, cunning, and avarice show that he was in morals

not greatly superior to that wicked king. Though courteous and pleasing in words, he had no touch of generosity, and promises with him went for nothing. His



ROBERT, DUKE OF
NORMANDY,
(1054?-1134).

From his tomb.
The crossed legs
are supposed to
denote a crusad-
ing vow.

virtue as a ruler is that he showed self-control and minute diligence. The "Lion of Justice" his people called him, and he ruled with a sway even-handed and impartial, yet often oppressive. For his time he was a highly educated man: he is said to have studied Greek, and he knew Latin, English, and of course his mother-tongue, French. His collection of animals at Woodstock, made for purposes of study, shows an inquiring mind. Yet he was not superior to the barbarism of his time, and once at least took revenge by putting out the eyes of innocent children. He had his race's passion for hunting. No baron might diminish the forests on his own estates or hunt in them without the royal permission, and the dogs in the neighbourhood of forests were maimed lest they should mar the king's pastime. Roger, Bishop of Salisbury, Henry's justiciar, developed a system by which officials known as Barons of the Exchequer went up and down the country closely watching the king's financial rights, and sometimes taking part in the administration of justice. Through them the king's hand was felt in every part of the kingdom.

Henry's heir, William, was drowned in 1120 in the wreck of the White Ship while crossing the Channel. To the king remained only a daughter, Matilda, who married the greatest potentate in Europe, the Emperor Henry V, and, left a widow in 1125, soon found a second husband in Geoffrey of Anjou. A woman's rule was scarcely known in that age, yet Henry planned that his daughter should succeed him, and his barons, and first among them Stephen, Earl of Blois, son of the Conqueror's daughter Adela, swore that Matilda should be their queen. Henry died in Normandy in 1135; but when they made his tomb in the abbey which he had founded at Reading it was not his daughter who ruled in England: Stephen of Blois had hurried across the Channel, seized the royal treasure, and reaping, like Henry himself, the reward of promptness, was duly chosen king.

Difficulties
about the
succession.

The reign of Stephen is one of the darkest in English history. The Norman kings had established a despotism

which only a strong man could administer, and such Stephen was not. He was gentle, brave, and generous; his manners were affable, and on occasion he could act with decisive energy, but he was a rash and reckless ruler. Insecure from the outset, he won support by giving titles and promises, and

under him the barons quickly recovered their old independence. The central administration was paralyzed, the law courts did not sit, taxes were not collected. Stephen brought mercenaries to England but could not pay them, and they paid themselves



STEPHEN.

From a silver coin of his reign.

by robbery. He debased the coinage, and thus alienated from his cause the growing mercantile class. The Church had promised to support him as long as he protected her liberties, but in 1138 he seized the castles of Roger, Bishop of Salisbury, and his nephews, the Bishops of Ely and Lincoln, and so alienated the Church that his own brother Henry, the powerful Bishop of Winchester, who had really made him king, turned against him.

The Scots, too, invaded England to support Matilda in 1138, but they met a decisive check in the Battle of the Standard, where the bow, though not the deadly long-bow of a later age, in the hands of the English peasant proved already a formidable weapon.

The Empress Matilda appeared in England in person in 1139; she soon held the west, and desultory war followed. Stephen fell into Matilda's hands, and in 1141

a synod at Winchester recognised her as queen, but her arrogance turned the nation against her, and Stephen's party drove her in time from the kingdom.

The struggle
between
Stephen and
Matilda.


To follow the struggle would be vain. The foundations of order were broken up, and England fell into so cruel an anarchy that

pious minds feared that Christ and his saints were asleep. Every one, it was said, did what was wrong in his own

The terrible
disorder of the
time.

eyes. To realize the state of the country is to understand the horrors of baronial disorder. Robber barons built hundreds of

"adulterine" castles, where they were safe, for the military skill of the time was almost helpless against such strongholds. They plundered the helpless peasantry and invented new tortures to force concealed treasures from their victims. Nottingham, Winchester, Lincoln, and other towns were burned or sacked. The plunderers destroyed even the crops in the fields. "You might go," says a writer of the time, "a day's journey and not find an inhabited village or an acre of tilled land."



PORCHESTER CASTLE, BUILT ABOUT 1150.

Note the few windows, to lessen danger from attack.

The disorder lasted in varying degree for nearly seventeen years, and Stephen was growing old when his son Eustace, for whose interests he had been working, died. Thus was removed the last obstacle to compromise

with Matilda, and Stephen accepted Matilda's son Henry as his heir. "In this year," writes an annalist in 1154,

The constructive forces of the period.

"passed away King Stephen to the place to which his deserts led." The writer shows

the rage of the time against a bad ruler.

Yet Stephen's reign was not wholly fruitless. Misfortune is the Church's opportunity, and in those years her power grew. She alone could offer a secure haven amid the prevailing anarchy, and one hundred and nineteen monasteries were built during the reign. While the functions

of the state were paralyzed, she held her synods and kept up her own discipline. It was, too, in the lawless days of Stephen that Vacarius came from Italy to England to lecture upon law and to teach new conceptions of order.



One truth all but the barons struggling for their selfish independence could read—that the chief safeguard of order was a strong king, and such the youth who now came to the throne

was to prove. Henry II¹ was a born ruler; at fifteen he swayed great continental dominions; at twenty-one he

¹ Henry was the son of the union of Geoffrey of Anjou with Matilda. The line is called the Angevin line, and sometimes the Plantagenet, from the bit of the plant *genêt*, or broom, worn by Geoffrey.

was sovereign of England. From his father he inherited Anjou and adjoining regions; from his mother, Normandy and England; through his wife, Eleanor of Aquitaine, he controlled that state. He was master of the seacoast from the Pyrenees to the Low Countries, and his continental dominions were twice as great as those of the King of France. Yet among his peoples there was no unity, and a great part of his life was passed in toilsome journeys through his realms, to no one of which he wholly belonged. Lord of many lands, he was in reality without a country.

Henry, red and freckled, with a powerful frame, short-cropped hair, and square face, is the picture of coarse-fibred vigour. His mind and body were ever active; even at mass he would write busily. In his restless journeyings he was often followed by the whole equipage of a court and government, and he moved sometimes with

amazing rapidity. "The King of England does not ride or sail, he flies," said the King of France. The disorder

The character
of Henry.

surrounding Henry was compared to the chaos of the infernal regions. He cared nothing for comfort, and though the age loved ceremony, there was at his court scarcely a trace of formality. Visitors might apparently approach him whenever they could find him, at dinner, in church, or even in bed. He would summon his great men for a council, and when his presence was expected would be found to have gone off for a day's hunting. Henry understood many languages, among them the despised tongue of his English subjects, which, however, he could not speak; he loved the society



HENRY II.

From his tomb at Fontevault.

of the educated, and surrounded himself with the purest and noblest characters of the time—usually men better than himself. For suffering he showed pity that was rare in his time and class: if he built few churches and monasteries, he founded many hospitals and refuges for the poor. Though a despot, he loved justice. But he was profligate; at times his temper was wild and ungovernable, and then his words were rash and blasphemous, his actions those of a madman, who tore off his clothes, rolled on the floor, and gnawed the straw. Sometimes he was deliberately faithless. He had a passionate love for his children, but used them as pawns in his game of politics, and expected them to submit; it was their disobedience that brought dark clouds upon his later years.

When Henry came to the throne, foreign mercenaries were roaming over the country, and there was abroad a spirit of defiance of the royal authority that boded ill to any but a very strong king. Order gradually reappeared. Henry took the lawless “adulterine” castles, sometimes by the slow method of starving out their garrison; he drove the foreign troops from the kingdom, and rallied to his support the classes who respected law. Soon he was involved in the great quarrel of his reign. Ever since the days of Hildebrand the Church had claimed not only complete independence of kings, but also the right to protect oppressed subjects from the abuses of kingly power. Her legal system, known as the Canon Law, was receiving renewed attention when Henry II came to the throne. Gratian published in 1151 a digest or summary of the canon law, arranged as the lawyers of the great Justinian had arranged the Roman civil law in the Pandects, and English ecclesiastics went to Bologna and learned in its schools the meaning and extent of the Church’s claims to jurisdiction, which were of such a character that authority in every mediæval

Henry's diffi-
culties.

Henry's
resistance to the
Church's claims.

state was divided on nearly equal terms between her and the civil power.

One of the first acts of Henry II was to appoint Thomas à Becket his chancellor. Becket, a great favourite at the court of Theobald, the aged Archbishop of Canterbury, was senior by fifteen years to the young king, and we may well doubt whether men so separated in age became the companions in work and play that tradition describes as a background for their later quarrels. Becket was in deacon's orders and technically an ecclesiastic, and he had studied the canon law in Italy, and impregnated his mind with its doctrines. But when he became chancellor he seemed to share Henry's plans for crushing the independent claims both of the Church and of the baronage. He forced new taxes upon the clergy, which they paid with bitter protests, and he took the field and fought in helmet and hauberk at the head of Henry's troops. He was handsome and cultivated, and lived in state greater than the king's. At last, in 1162, when Archbishop Theobald died, Thomas à Becket, at the age of forty-four, became Archbishop of Canterbury.



THOMAS À BECKET.
(1118?-1170).
From his seal.

Becket had taken no part in the profligate life of Henry's court, and no one of vicious character was among his friends. There is no contradiction between his earlier career as chancellor and his later as archbishop. He devoted himself wholly to the task of the moment. As archbishop, one fixed idea—to assert the Church's rights—absorbed him, and fearlessly and obstinately, with no thought of compromise, he fought Henry to the bitter end. Wise men of his own class feared his extreme tendencies. Gilbert

Becket's policy
as archbishop.

Foliot, Bishop of London, an abler man and as good a churchman, once, after long and vain remonstrances, said to him bluntly, "You were ever a fool, you are still one, and you always will be one." His outward demeanour changed as soon as he was consecrated archbishop. His habits became ascetic and his charities enormous. He rose in the night for prayer, and at daybreak was busy studying the Scriptures; he washed the feet of thirteen poor men daily and served them at table; beneath his rich garments he wore a hair shirt. Becket conformed to the standard of saintship of his time, and there is no reason to doubt his sincerity or devotion. To the king's disgust he promptly resigned the chancellorship, holding its duties to be incompatible with those of his new position, and at once disputes began; first, upon questions of taxation, and then about the jurisdiction over clerics who committed crime. Every one admitted that there were evils which required correction. The Church was a great landowner, and though among her officials there were some, half priests, half laymen, as violent and lawless as any of the king's subjects, even the humblest officer of the Church had the privilege of being tried by the ecclesiastical courts. The murderer, if a layman, might be executed; if in clerical orders he could be only fined, whipped, banished, or degraded from the ranks of the clergy. Henry had a passion for good government, and yet in the first nine years of his reign he saw, it is said, a hundred clerical murderers go almost unpunished, and as the law stood he was powerless to interfere.

When Henry found that he could not rely upon Becket for help, he turned to the barons and the bishops and called them to meet him at the royal hunting-seat of Clarendon, in the nearest approach to a modern Parliament which had yet developed. His plan was to impose restrictions upon the clerical courts. That Becket should struggle against

The assembly
at Clarendon,
1164.

this was not strange: no order is likely to surrender great privileges voluntarily, and Becket could claim with reason that the Church courts often gave better justice than the secular. Yet he was forced to become the champion of criminal clerics who escaped the punishment meted out to lay offenders. He was forced, too, into an unpatriotic attitude as the upholder of a right of appeal to a foreign power, the Pope, to whom the appeals went from the ecclesiastical courts. But if Becket struggled selfishly for the threatened privileges of an order, Henry too had his own interests to serve, for the fines levied in the ecclesiastical courts amounted to more than the revenues of the crown, and he was eager to lay hands upon this spoil. At Clarendon he and Becket fought out the question point by point. Henry demanded that Becket should assent to the ancient customs of the realm. Becket, anxious to appear as claiming only undoubted rights, promised to do so. Then he saw that he had been trapped. What were the vague customs that he undertook thus publicly to obey? Henry soon made this clear. A committee composed of the oldest and wisest of the barons drew up hurriedly, within nine days, a document famous in history as the Constitutions of Clarendon. In sixteen articles it defined the ancient customs, and Becket saw at once that to put his seal to them was to surrender all for which he had been struggling. There were to be no appeals to Rome; the clergy might not even go abroad without the king's consent; the king himself was to be supreme over the Church courts; clerics must appear before laymen. Hitherto any one ordained by a bishop had been held to have become by this act a freeman, but bishops were now forbidden to interfere with a lord's power over his vassals, and might no longer ordain a villein without his lord's consent. Undoubtedly for most of these provisions warrant could be found in the ancient customs of England, but, since

Hildebrand's time, new views of Church authority had ripened, and the more gentle Anselm would assuredly not have assented to what was demanded of Becket. For six days he vainly opposed the constitutions clause by clause. The debates ended, and the king demanded that Becket and the other bishops should affix their seals to the document. "I will never seal them, never as long as I breathe," said Becket. He withdrew to Winchester, full



HENRY II BANISHING BECKET'S RELATIVES.

of remorse that he had given even a verbal promise to obey the customs. Nine months later he again met the king in a council at Northampton, but was still defiant, and at length

boldly announcing his appeal to Rome, he escaped from Northampton in disguise, and after an adventurous journey reached the Continent.

Henry was powerless to reach Becket, but he relentlessly banished his relatives from England. The Cister-

Becket's
murder.

cians ventured to shelter Becket at Pontigny and Henry forced them to drive him out; the

King of France received Becket at Sens, and Henry made war upon France. Becket used his own weapon, excommunication, and the bitter quarrel went on for six years. But Henry meanwhile carried out the work of reform in England, and Pope Alexander III, himself troubled by a schism, was afraid to take action against so powerful a supporter. In July, 1170, a truce was made. Neither party had yielded, for the old conditions were to remain. Becket returned to England, though only, as it proved, to be involved in new disputes. He refused to obey the king's demand that he should absolve three ex-

communicated bishops. Henry was on the continent at his hunting-seat of Bures, near Bayeux, when the three bishops, who had hurried across the Channel, fell at his feet and told their story. In a passion Henry burst out, "Will none of the cowards who eat my bread rid me of this turbulent priest?" Four knights thought this a warrant to kill the archbishop, and before they slept on that Christmas eve took a solemn vow to do so. They separated, to meet a few days later near Canterbury. On the evening of December 29 their crime was consummated, and Thomas à Becket was brutally murdered in the north transept of his cathedral church.



MURDER OF BECKET.

The murder of Becket seemed for a time disastrous to Henry. His own words had caused it; but at once he sent messengers to the Pope protesting his innocence of the murder, and to be for a time out of the reach of adverse action he hurried to England and thence on to remote Ireland. The perpetrators of the murder were, it seems, never punished, owing to a doubt whether the Church or the state should try them. By the murder the Church for the time gained something: Becket's

The results of
Becket's
murder.

successor swore fealty to the king with the modifying words "saving my order," the use of which had been



SCOURGING OF HENRY II AT BECKET'S TOMB.

denied to the martyr. Mention was not even made of observing the customs of the realm, and Henry formally renounced the Constitutions of Clarendon and did penance at Becket's tomb. None the less was all real power left in his hands. He still appointed the bishops, and his nominees were secular in tone and ready to do his will.

Real victor over the Church, Henry

next humbled the barons. The first monarch of his age needed a great army, and since his English vassals who owed him military aid would hardly go in person to con-

tinental wars in which they were not concerned, he took from them in lieu of personal service a money payment called Scutage.

There was apparently no resistance, and the levying of scutage furnished the king with money to keep troops in the field as he wished. He made other changes. Whoever held the area known as a knight's fee had been required to serve the king at his own expense, but only for forty days in each year, a period too short for effective action. Henry now required three knights to join in equipping one of their number who should be at his disposal, not for forty, but for one hundred and

Henry's
pressure upon
the baronage.

twenty days—long enough to complete a campaign. He employed besides mercenary troops, and soon had what was practically a standing army. His Assize of Arms of 1181, when he had the barons at last under his feet, so reorganized the old fyrd, or national militia, that every freeholder must henceforth be ready to bear arms.

Not only on the military but on the civil side Henry showed the barons that he was to be master of his kingdom. They disputed the jurisdiction of the County Courts, and their estates were often strongholds which the king's officers dared not enter, and where criminals were shielded from the king's justice. Henry's Assize (or statute) of Clarendon of 1166 ordered the barons to appear before the County Courts and to do nothing to keep the king's sheriffs from discharging their duty.

Four years later, in 1170, Henry's Inquest of Sheriffs, an official inquiry into their conduct, revealed great evils. The sheriff in each county collected the king's revenues, and Henry found that the local magnates who usually held the office were doing their work not in his interests but in their own.

By one sweeping change he dismissed nearly all the sheriffs, and appointed in their stead men upon whose devotion he could rely. Justice had been slow-footed and corrupt, and the Assize of Clarendon had begun the attack upon these evils; by that

of Northampton, in 1176, Henry completed a judicial revolution. He divided the country into six circuits, with three judges for each circuit. These now went up and down the land and checked in the king's

name the local tyranny of which the barons had often been guilty. At the same time they drew into Henry's coffers large revenues from the fines and forfeitures which they imposed.

Assize of Arms,
1181.

The barons
forced to appear
in the County
Court. The
sheriffs
dismissed.

Assize of Clarendon,
1166.

Inquest of
Sheriffs, 1170.

The reorganiza-
tion of justice.

Assize of
Northampton,
1176.

In 1173, before these reforms were completed, the barons, who watched them with growing anger, broke out into savage revolt. Henry's peril was great, but he was saved by his own energy and by the support of the people. Dim echoes of a terrific conflict come to us. In both England and France the barons attacked the king; the Irish revolted; the Scots invaded England; London was the scene of organized pillage and murder. But Henry was strong. At Fornham ten thousand foreign troops brought by the barons to England are said to have been slain; there was cruel slaughter at Nottingham, Norwich, and other places, and the rising was at length crushed. Henry was supreme throughout England for the rest of his days.

The barons take up arms against the king's reforms and are crushed.

To rule England was only a part of Henry's plans. Ireland was at his doors. That island, like England, had been harassed by the Northmen, who gained a permanent footing on the coast at Dublin, Waterford, Cork, and Limerick, but had hardly penetrated to the interior, still held by half-savage clans. Henry saw the importance of Ireland, and at his request Adrian IV, the only Englishman who has ever been Pope, gave him the Church's warrant to subdue that country. Irish faction aided the English plan. Richard de Clare, Earl of Striguil, surnamed Strongbow, a leader among the nobles of the Welsh border, went to Ireland, married the daughter of Dermot, one of the warring chieftains, and was soon, by superior arms and organization, in a fair way to master the country. Just after Becket's murder, Henry, who had no desire to see one of his own nobles supreme in Ireland, himself went over and spent a winter in the country, and in the end every ruler in Ireland, save the King of Connaught, did homage to the mighty sovereign who had come among them. He left Hugh de Lacy as his viceroy, and a little later made his

The conquest of Ireland, 1171.

son John Lord of Ireland, and granted half the island to needy followers. Little was done to give it good government, but from that time the King of England has claimed authority in Ireland too, and the unhappy war of races has gone on.

The declining years of Henry were full of misery. He planned that his sons should rule subordinate kingdoms under him as sovereign lord, and in 1170 his son Henry was crowned King of England. It was a great mistake; English precedent, which knew nothing of such a subordinate kingship as Henry desired, was violated, and the young man besides used his new authority against his father. When the barons revolted Henry's sons were on the side of his enemies; his wife, Eleanor, too, was found among them, in a man's disguise, and he kept her in prison for the rest of his days. The young Henry and Geoffrey, another son, soon died, but Richard and John, resenting their father's attempted control, leagued themselves with Henry's great enemy, the King of France. It is a long, sad story, the scene of which is laid not in England, but in Henry's dominions abroad. The old king was at last beaten. At Colombières, in July, 1189, he was forced, among other humiliations, to agree to hand over his Angevin dominions absolutely to Richard, and to release from allegiance to himself all who had worked with Richard. They carried him sick and dying to Chinon, his early home. John was the favourite son for whose good he had specially toiled, and when they brought to him in his bed the list of those whose allegiance was to be transferred to Richard, the first name was John's. "Has John, my very heart, my darling child, indeed forsaken me?" cried Henry. He turned his face to the wall and moaned: "Let things go as they will. For myself or for the world I care no more." During the three days he lay dying his servants robbed him of

Henry's
unhappiness
and disasters
in his later
years.

every valuable on which they could seize; when he was dead they stripped his body and left it naked upon the floor in the bare room. But there were some to restore order, and Henry II, upon the day after his death, was carried in royal state to the tomb at Fontevrault. His work lived after him. It was really he who brought baron and churchman alike under the sway of English law, who saved England from feudal anarchy, and made justice uniform and the king's arm effective through all the land.


SUMMARY OF DATES

Soon after William I's Coronation the English revolted; to check them he **ravaged the North in 1069**, but apparently not before 1076 did Hereward, the last leader of the English rebels, make peace. William invaded Scotland in **1072**, and from **1074 to 1080** he was occupied with rebellions by his own Norman followers, especially his son Robert. **The Great Survey** recorded in **Domesday Book** was completed in **1086**, and the oath from the landholders was taken at Salisbury in the same year. William Rufus, who succeeded in 1087, was the author of no memorable achievement; but during his reign the **First Crusade** began in **1095** and the Crusaders took Jerusalem in 1099. **Henry I's Charter** was issued in **1100**, he crushed his brother Robert at **Tenchebrai in 1106**, and settled the dispute with Anselm about **Investitures in 1107**. Roger of Salisbury began his work of reorganizing the law courts and finance in the same year. The Scots attacked Henry's successor, Stephen, and were defeated at the **Battle of the Standard in 1138**; the **Second Crusade** began in **1147**. By the **Treaty of Wallingford in 1153** Henry II's succession to the throne in 1154 was assured. Thomas à Becket was made archbishop in 1162, and his quarrel with Henry became acute when Henry insisted upon the **Constitutions of Clarendon in 1164**. **The Assize of Clarendon in 1166** checked the feudal baronage, and the **English Conquest of Ireland** was in **1171**. Henry dismissed most of the sheriffs by the **Inquest of Sheriffs in 1170**, and in the same year occurred the **Murder of Becket**. **The Baron's Revolt** was in **1173-'74**. **The Assize of Northampton in 1176** brought them more completely under the royal judges, and the **Assize of Arms in 1181** gave the king more independent military power. In 1187 Jerusalem fell before Saladin; crusading zeal revived, and the **Third Crusade** began in **1188**.

BOOKS FOR REFERENCE

* Freeman, William the Conqueror (1888); Freeman, The Norman Conquest (6 vols., 1867-'79); Freeman, The Reign of William Rufus (2 vols., 1882); Norgate, England under the Angevin Kings (2 vols., 1887); Round, Feudal England (1895); * Green, Henry II (1892); Hutton (Editor), St. Thomas of Canterbury (1889), (extracts from contemporary writers); * Church, St. Anselm (1888).

THE ANGEVIN OR PLANTAGENET KINGS OF ENGLAND



* Eleanor bore Edward I in all four sons and nine daughters, and Margaret bore him two sons and a daughter.

CHAPTER VII

The Struggle against Royal Despotism and the Rise of the Commons as a Factor in Government

(1189 to 1307—118 years)

Richard I	born 1157; succeeded 1189; died 1199.
John	" 1165; " 1199; " 1216.
Henry III	" 1207; " 1216; " 1272.
Edward I	" 1239; " 1272; " 1307.

[The period covers "The Wonderful Thirteenth Century" in which the Middle Ages reach their highest civilization and the great forces of modern life begin to appear. By the middle of the century, after a long struggle with the Emperor Frederick II, the Church won final victory over the empire, and in 1250 Frederick died under her ban. The popes seemed supreme, and Boniface VIII in 1296 (by the bull *Clericis laicos*) went so far as to forbid the clergy to pay taxes to the state without his consent. In consequence a quarrel broke out between him and Philip IV of France. The French seized Rome; a Frenchman, Clement V, was on Boniface's death made Pope, and after 1309 the popes lived at Avignon in bondage to French policy. The period thus saw not only the empire but the papacy humbled. Feudalism is giving way before centralized monarchies under such great kings as Louis IX of France and Edward I of England, and the king's power is, in England at least, controlled by representative assemblies—a new type of government which still prevails. Many-sided activities made the age richly productive. St. Francis of Assisi and St. Dominic founded the mendicant orders, which devoted themselves especially to the care of the poor, to preaching, and to education. Gothic architecture reached its highest development. The Universities now appear. Dante wrote during this period, and also the great theologian of the mediæval church, Thomas Aquinas. Roger Bacon is the forerunner in this age of the modern scientific school of thought, and Giotto began to lay the foundation of modern painting. The towns are growing steadily more important. The two centuries following were much less orderly and progressive.]

HENRY II's rebellious son Richard succeeded tranquilly to the throne. He was a foreigner, and spent but a few months of his life in England; the crusades haunted his mind, and the head of the Church encouraged, even ordered him to place the crusader's duties before the king's. Richard has been called "a splendid savage." He lived indeed in a rude age, but he had its virtues as well as its vices. He

The reign of
Richard I.

The character
of Richard.

proved magnanimous to his father's friends who had been his own foes, and kind and indulgent to his brother John. He had a real zeal for order, justice, and religion, was resolute, straightforward, and thorough, a skilful military leader and a successful naval commander. It was weak credulity that had made him a bad son to his father, who, he was told, wished to deprive him of his rights. Indulging his love of pomp he was crowned with great state: there was a general jail-delivery, and also a massacre of Jews, who shocked Christian sentiment by venturing to intrude their unbelieving presence at the Christian ceremony of coronation.



RICHARD I.

From his great seal. Note the flexible chain armour in contrast with the later plate armour.

Richard was in great haste to go to the rescue of Jerusalem, which had again fallen into infidel hands. To raise money for his expedition he sold what he could—royal castles and manors, bishoprics, office and the right to give up office, charters to towns, and his feudal supremacy over Scotland; he is reported to have said that he would sell Lon-

Richard goes to
the East as a
crusader.

don itself if he could find a purchaser rich enough. With the enormous sums thus raised he equipped the greatest army that had ever left the shores of England. He had also a fleet: while his rival Philip of France was forced to sail in Genoese ships, it was in English ships that Richard went through the Mediterranean to the East. But the crusading army had no unity to oppose to

Richard's
failure in the
East,
shipwreck and
captivity, 1192.

the despotic power of the great Sultan Saladin, and was playing a losing game. Richard fought with dash and heroism, and amidst treachery and envy on every side his conduct appears worthy of praise. He won victories, but even then could secure only a truce which gave Christians for three years the right of access to the holy places. Journeying homeward he was shipwrecked in the upper Adriatic, was seized by his fellow crusader, Leopold, Duke of Austria, and basely sold to the Emperor Henry VI. His brother John, faithless always, joined Philip of France in bribing the emperor to retain his prisoner, and only after more than a year's imprisonment and when his overtaxed people had managed to pay a huge ransom did Richard reach England. Even then he stayed but a

His later years
and death.

few weeks, and was soon busy in his continental dominions. He longed, but was unable, to return to the East, and spent his remaining six years in war with Philip of France. In 1199, while



CRUSADING KNIGHT.

Note the frequency of the cross.

besieging the obscure castle of Chaluz-Chabrol, he fell mortally wounded, and was buried near his father at Fontevrault.

The reign of Richard was not as disastrous to England as might be supposed. His people, who were obliged to pay heavily for his ransom and his wars, were yet proud of the lion-hearted king, the most famous warrior of the age. Constitutional liberty grew in his absence. William Longchamp, the chancellor whom he left in authority, proved a bad ruler and the barons promptly drove him out of the country, and showed that, if not the king himself, at least the king's minister, was responsible to the nation, and that a king's officer who defied law must be checked, as were the former lawless barons. If liberties were sold by Richard to municipalities, these also bought and retained them. Hubert Walter, who in the end succeeded the deposed Longchamp, allowed the people to assess by their own juries the taxes which they were forced to pay, and to have an important voice in the affairs of the shire, and the next king who tried to play the tyrant in England found that a new spirit had developed.

John, Richard's successor, is the first of the Conqueror's line who was an Englishman, in the sense that he had lived almost wholly in England. Sweeping verdicts are rarely just, but we can find no ground for thinking John less base than he is painted. He proved a traitor to his indulgent father, and to Richard, who made every effort to win his love; it is probable that he murdered the son of another brother. He betrayed in turn every class in the state—the barons, the clergy, the people. His mother, Eleanor, alone appears to have had a restraining influence upon him, and after her death his character and policy became pitiless. While he ruled no woman's honour was safe. He

Real political
progress during
the reign.

The depraved
character of
John.

could be courteous and winning in manner, but when he gave way to passion he raved and swore "by God's teeth and feet," gnashed his jaws, and chewed sticks and straw like a maniac. He had the abilities, lacking in few of the Plantagenets, and was capable of bursts of energy, formidable as a warrior, and by no means a fool. But his frivolous nature made him reckless and indolent, and he usually tried to avert disaster when it was too late. He appears to have had no religious faith, and refused to take the communion at his coronation. In contrast with Richard's passionate and generous remorse, John's regret for his crimes never rises above the level of guilty and superstitious fear.



KING JOHN.

From his tomb.

The boy Arthur, son of John's elder brother Geoffrey, was, in the line of hereditary descent, heir to the throne. But when John was crowned Hubert Walter asserted in strong terms that the nation might choose its own king, and that John was such by no hereditary right, but because he was the fittest of the royal line. John succeeded also to Richard's continental dominions. Philip Augustus of France supported Arthur, in the hope of ultimately securing Normandy, into which he could easily throw a large force. Richard I had seen this, and to check France, built Château Gaillard, the great "Saucy Castle," barring the way from Paris to the Norman capital, Rouen. The young Arthur fell into John's hands, disappeared, and, without doubt, was murdered, and the belief was general that John was guilty of the crime. Philip appealed to the Normans against a murderer, attacked Château Gail-

The murder of Arthur, 1203, and the loss of Normandy, 1204.

lard, which fell after a terrible siege, and then the way was open from Paris to Rouen. John seemed dazed by this disaster, and struck scarcely a blow; in 1204, Normandy, Maine, Anjou, and Touraine passed under the direct sovereignty of France.

John's evil course wrought a good for England, since he was now thrown back wholly upon that kingdom. He

John's oppres-
sions of the
baronage.

summoned the English baronage to meet him upon the coast to go to recover Normandy, but when they gathered he did nothing decisive, finally sent them home, and then made them pay for the non-performance of military service. Later, he

did lead the barons to France, but soon agreed to a truce, leaving Philip in possession of his prize.

John's tenants-in-chief suffered at his hands every extortion and indignity that a tyrannous feudal lord could inflict. He sold so-called justice, and used his legal right to the wardship of heirs who were minors, to sell the custody of them and their property to the highest bidders; heiresses and widows, of whom he

was the feudal guardian or lord, were also made objects of barter. He imprisoned men on mere suspicion, banished them without trial, ravaged their lands, and levied unaccustomed and intolerable taxes.



CHÂTEAU GAILLARD.

(After Turner.)

When the barons were already restless under these evils, John had the folly to enter upon a struggle with the Church. When Hubert Walter, Archbishop of Canterbury, died in 1205, the younger monks of Canterbury hurriedly elected their sub-prior as archbishop, and sent him to Rome for confirmation, while the elder monks supported the candidate whom John sent to Rome, John de Grey, Bishop of Norwich. But Pope Innocent III, the strongest and most determined man of his time, took advantage of the dispute to reject both claimants, and appointed his own nominee, Stephen Langton, an English cardinal at Rome. The Canterbury monks acquiesced, and confirmed the nomination, but John was furious. He drove the new archbishop's father from England, refused to allow Langton himself to put his foot in the country, and finally seized some of the Church's possessions. Innocent was not the man to be compelled by such means to give up his purpose, and he promptly placed England under an interdict and closed the churches; baptism and extreme unction were allowed, but apparently no religious rites hallowed marriage or burial. John, as a chronicler says, was "wonderfully little disturbed," and probably the clergy did not fully obey the interdict, under which England lay for nearly seven years. During this time John showed considerable vigour as a warrior. He forced homage and tribute from the King of Scotland, crossed to Ireland and reduced to obedience the English settlers who were already claiming independence, and brought Llewellyn of Wales to terms.

At last the Pope forged his final weapon. In 1212 he formally absolved John's subjects from their allegiance, and invited Philip of France to seize England as he had already seized Normandy. John, with both a foreign foe and the nation, whose liberties he had outraged, against him, was seized with panic at the prophecy of a hermit,

John attacks
the Church.

Peter of Pomfret, that within ten days he should cease to reign. To yield to the Church seemed the easiest way

John, in danger of deposition, does homage to the Pope for his kingdom and becomes his vassal, 1213.

to retain the crown, and he suddenly conceded every point, received Langton as archbishop, restored the Church's property, and did homage to the Pope for England as a vassal state. No English king had ever before surrendered so much to the Church. When the fatal

day passed, of which Peter prophesied, and John was still king, he took revenge for his terror by hanging the prophet. No longer, however, was he really king. By his own act he had turned a free sovereignty into vassalage to

The barons, the English Church led by Langton, and the people unite against John and force from him the Great Charter, 1215.

a foreign power, and the nation's anger was aroused. Langton, a patriotic Englishman, was in a difficult position between his duty to the Pope and to his country, but finally joined the patriotic side. John went to France to arrest the proposed attack on England, but the English were totally routed at Bouvines in 1214. In England, his foes took the field

with an army, which they called the Army of God and the Church, though the head of the Roman Church was on John's side. He was powerless against every class in the realm, and at length yielded. On June 15, 1215, at the demand of the outraged nation, he signed at Runnymede, near Windsor, the famous document known as Magna Charta.


The Great Charter established no new liberties; the barons preferred to claim only those which their fathers

The terms of the Great Charter.

enjoyed under earlier kings. But they knew that John would repudiate the charter as soon as he could, and now made him agree

that twenty-five barons should be appointed to watch his conduct, and that these might, if necessary, compel him to keep faith. This is the new and distinctive feature of the charter. Never before had a king of England been brought so low as to admit that his subjects might law-

fully take up arms against him. Henceforth justice was to be administered by men who knew the law and was not to be sold; no man was to be imprisoned or injured in his property without lawful judgment; the goods of



WILLIAM MARSHALL,
EARL OF PEMBROKE
(D. 1219).

those who died without a will were to go peacefully to their heirs; the king was to make levies upon his tenants-in-chief only for his ransom, if a prisoner, or for the knighting of his eldest son, or for the marriage of his eldest daughter, and no new taxes were to be imposed without the consent of those concerned. The charter provides that the tenants of the barons should themselves have the identical rights that the barons claimed as tenants of the king, and this provision shows that the barons who, under Henry II, had struggled for their own position only, now worked for the nation itself. The humblest vassal in the kingdom had the same interest as they in the charter.

John, of course, as was expected, denounced the charter, the Pope declared it null and void, condemned those who had forced the king to sign it, and suspended Langton as archbishop. War

broke out again, and the barons' party was managed so badly that John won some successes. The barons looked

round for a leader and offered the English crown to Louis, son of Philip, of France. Louis came readily enough, showed himself a good soldier, and was in a fair way to win England. But fortunately at this crisis John

John breaks
faith, and the
barons offer the
crown to Louis
of France.

died, possibly, as Shakespeare depicts, of poison. His vices had united England; his death reunited her in

favour of his innocent son, Henry, and against the foreign leader. At Lincoln on land, near Dover on the sea, the forces of Louis met with severe reverses. The loyalists were now ably led by William Marshall, Earl of Pembroke, regent for the infant king, and Louis, seeing that the nation was with the young Henry, wisely made terms and retired.

John's death,
1216.

For the first time since the Conquest England had an infant king. Lofty heights of virtue would hardly be looked for in the son of John: Henry III proved perhaps better than could have been expected. His life was unstained by the graver vices; he loved art and literature and had refined tastes; he was not cruel; he was a good husband and father, a devotee and great builder of churches: the Westminster Abbey of to-day is substantially his creation. Yet, like his father, he proved a bad king. Ruler in name at nine, reared in full view of the throne in days when the power of kings was despotic, he grew up vain, extravagant, and headstrong.

The character
of Henry III.

John's surrender to the Church had lasting consequences. Henry when crowned also acknowledged himself the Pope's vassal and agreed to pay the yearly tribute of 1,000 marks. Remembering, no doubt, his father's humiliation, he never defied the Pope, who came to rely upon Henry's realm to supply large sums of money. England was steadily increasing in wealth. "London," said Henry, "has a surfeit of riches; it is an inexhaustible well." The popes' needs were pressing and their demands on wealthy England grew steadily. In 1237 a papal legate arrived in England to reorganize the Church of England. He appointed many Italians to English posts, and in 1240 demanded that three hundred more Italians should be provided for before anything was given to Englishmen.

Henry's
submissive
policy in regard
to the Church.

One Master Martin went about England in 1244 extorting, in the Pope's name, rich gifts from the clergy, and, with the Pope's authority behind him, naming his own friends and relations to English benefices. Grosseteste, the good Bishop of Lincoln, estimated that foreigners drew annually from English benefices three times the amount of the revenues of the king. Appeals to Rome in law cases, forbidden by Henry II, were now many and heavy fees were paid by suitors. But the people at last grew restive; there were riots in London, where a papal nominee to a benefice was killed in the streets, and at Oxford students forced the legate to fly. The king, however, did nothing to protect his people.

In civil affairs Henry tried to play the despot. William Marshall, Earl of Pembroke, was regent until his death in 1219, and during his short tenure of authority England was well governed. But it was no easy task to undo the mischief of the civil war under John: for years lawless foreigners like Falkes de Breauté continued to hold royal castles and to defy Henry's ministers. In 1227, Henry, at the age of nineteen, declared his determination to govern alone. England needed peace, but he plunged at once into the pageantry of war. He invaded Wales, but there soon made terms; he invaded France to secure his possessions of Gascony and to try to recover Normandy. After 1232, when he suddenly dismissed the great justiciar Hubert de Burgh, the last of the statesmen trained under Henry II, Pierre des Roches and others from the king's continental state of Poitou surrounded him, but they gave way to other foreigners when, in 1236, Henry married Eleanor of Provence. Many of her relatives came to England, and sees like Canterbury and Winchester and the great earldoms of Pembroke and Richmond, fell in time to them. The English chafed under these foreign rulers; the Londoners even attacked the

Henry
encourages
foreign
influence in
England.

foreign queen herself as she passed up the Thames, and her life was in danger.

Henry was weak and incompetent in an age of able rulers; his brother-in-law, the Emperor Frederick II, and Louis IX, King of France, are among the greatest in the annals of mankind; there was not a weak pope during the whole of Henry's reign. When Frederick II fell in 1250 in his

The long-continued bad government of Henry.

struggle with the Church, the Pope named Henry's son Edmund to succeed Frederick in Sicily. The facile Henry took the bait, was drawn into the empty scheme of obtaining a new realm for his family, and pledged himself for enormous sums, to raise which he robbed his people. They repeatedly demanded the charter. He granted it, and then violated its terms, seized property unlawfully, sold and denied justice; he visited abbeys, accepted their hospitality, and then carried off what valuables he could find; he went about demanding presents from his people, who nicknamed him "the beggar"; he took the cross repeatedly and taxed the clergy for visionary crusades. Boniface, Archbishop of Canterbury, and other ecclesiastics, in a solemn service at London, made a dramatic protest. They suddenly dashed lighted candles to the ground and prayed amidst the smoke and stench that all violating the charter might likewise "perish and stink in hell." Henry was impressed, promised by the help of God, and as a man, a Christian, a knight, and a crowned and anointed king, to be true to the charter; yet soon again he was carrying on the old illegal tyranny. No words could bind him, and his faithlessness, like that of Charles I, brought the nation to civil war. In 1244 an assembly of the baronage and the bishops, which included Simon de Montfort, Grosseteste, the great Bishop of Lincoln, and Cantilupe, the scarcely less great Bishop of Worcester, demanded control over the appointment of the king's ministers. Year by year the demand was repeated.

Henry's situation grew steadily worse. He had already lost Poitou, a part of the dominions that came to the English kings through Henry II's wife, Eleanor of Aquitaine, and Gascony was in danger. He had piled up huge debts by letting the Pope use England's credit for a war in Sicily, and at last, in 1257, he practically confessed bankruptcy. A papal agent came promptly threatening excommunication and the interdict if the pledges of England were not met.

Simon de Montfort, who now becomes leader as the champion of English liberties, was hardly an English-

The character
and aims of
Simon de Mont-
fort, leader of
the baronial
party.

man. His father, a noble of Aquitaine, had the glory, as it seemed to the

mediæval world, of being the destroyer of the heretic Albigenses. Through his mother, Simon had some claim to the estates and title of the earldom of Leicester. He came to England, secured his title, and after the death of the young William Marshall, Earl of Pembroke, married his widow, Henry's sister Eleanor. High English nobles were angry at the success of the foreigner, and Henry had no love for but rather feared his brother-in-law. This proud, ambitious, resolute, active, unscrupulous man, read the spirit of his age better perhaps than any one else. He saw that the time had



SIMON DE MONTFORT (FATHER OF THE ENGLISH SIMON) (D. 1218).

From a window at Chartres about 1231.
Note the shield and head-piece.

come to place government in England on a broader basis, and that the despotic rule of the early Williams and Henrys could no longer survive. A real national sentiment and national life now existed, and yet the body which may now be called the Parliament that spoke for the nation was composed of only the baronage and the higher clergy: the smaller landholders, the country gentlemen, or knights of the shire, and the merchants, had no voice in the nation's councils. What ulterior designs were working in the deep mind of Simon when he began to champion the cause of the people, we do not know. Though personally devout, he opposed the Church, and this he would hardly have done had he aimed to become king. The people loved him as no other leader of that age was loved.

In April, 1258, Parliament assembled in arms and insisted that the king should in effect hand over his power to a committee of twenty-four, through whom the governing council of state should be chosen. At Oxford the "Mad Parliament" confirmed this and made the sheriffs' tenure of office annual, provided that Parliament should be called three times a year, that to it four knights from each county should report abuses, and that the influence of foreigners should be checked. Henry swore to observe the Provisions of Oxford. He was in effect a deposed king, and Simon de Montfort was supreme. To his friends went the great offices of state, and it looked almost as if a parliamentary *régime* had been established. Even Edward, Henry's son, for a time joined with his whole heart in the work of Simon.

To hold Henry to an oath was as impossible as to preserve unity among rivals on the barons' side. After a few years the validity of the Provisions of Oxford was referred to Louis IX of France, both sides agreeing to abide by his decision. Louis was a wise and just man, but he had a king's prejudices, and his award, the Mise,

Restrictions
upon the king's
authority.

The Provisions
of Oxford, 1258.

or settlement, of Amiens (1264), a judgment supported also by the Pope, declared that the Provisions of Oxford, as an interference with kingly power, were null and void, and that Henry might appoint his own ministers. The barons appealed to the sword against Louis's judgment, secured, they claimed, by undue influence. Once more

The Provisions of Oxford set aside, and civil war breaks out, 1264-'65.

there was civil war, disastrous to the king, who was defeated with great slaughter at Lewes in 1264. Simon de Montfort now won the nation's heart anew by calling a parliament in which with the nobility and prelates sat representatives of the lower clergy, the gentry, the trading classes—all apparently in one chamber. The war continued, the king's side being led by the young and able Edward, Henry's heir, who broke away from his earlier associations with the popular leader, and Simon de

Defeat and death of Simon de Montfort, 1265.

Montfort was defeated and killed in battle at Evesham in 1265. His body was horribly mutilated, there were many cruel excesses, and England was slowly reduced again to

Henry's authority. It seemed as if the popular cause was lost. But the young Prince Edward, who now really ruled, was wiser than his father, and made an agreement

Henry's son Edward is now supreme and makes concessions.

with the rebels, the Dictum of Kenilworth (October, 1266), which reaffirmed the charter, and the Statute of Marlborough (1267) finally granted the reforms demanded. By


1270 Edward left England secure and quiet, to go to the East, the last of the great crusaders, and while he was there Henry III died in 1272. Not until 1274 did Edward assume his crown, but meanwhile England was tranquil notwithstanding many elements of unrest that still existed.

Edward I was the first king of England since the Conquest who used constantly in daily life the English tongue,

and the first also to give a permanent share in the government to all classes in the state. Tall, upright, well-proportioned, slim in figure, but deep in chest, Edward was in youth a model of manly vigour.

The character
of Edward I.

Age did not bend his form nor wholly check his activity: on the morning of the battle of Falkirk his horse kicked him and broke two of his ribs, yet the old king rode into battle and was in the saddle the whole day. His powerful frame and long arms made him formidable in tilt and tournament, of which, and of hunting, he was fond. Edward's virtues were in advance of his time; his vices belonged to it. The tender-hearted young prince, who stood on the seashore weeping until the ship that carried away his beloved father to France was out of sight, could yet order his followers to tear an ear and eye from a plebeian youth, who crossed his path inopportunely. He was greedy of power, ambitious, cruel, proud, and vindictive. Yet, considering the times, he was a good man and a great king. He had a



EDWARD I.

From his great seal. Note the elaborate head-piece as compared with William I and Richard I.

devout love of truth and justice and real manliness of character. His life was pure and he was unchanging to his friends; his treasured motto, "Keep faith," was no mockery on his lips. No one learned deeper lessons from adversity, and when he made mistakes he was not ashamed frankly to confess them even with tears, and tell his people that he would do better. There was nothing sordid

or mean in his aims. The crusading movement was dead, but Edward still had the chivalrous dream of rescuing the Holy Land, and he fought there almost alone when little of glory was to be won. "Though my soldiers and my countrymen desert me," he said, "I will go alone to Acre with Fowin, my groom, and keep to the death my word and my oath."

Wales and Scotland, and Edward's own clergy, barons, and people, were restless when he came to the throne. He attacked the difficulties in Wales first. The conquest of Wales. The little principality, saved by its mountains, had retained a certain independence. Though long in vassalage to the English crown, the Welsh remembered that they were the descendants of the old Celtic race which once had ruled all Britain, and their able and vigorous Prince Llewellyn began to dream of driving out the English invader. But Wales was rent by faction and weak because of its barbarism; murder could still be paid for by a money fine, and the law recognised the right to pillage and slay mariners wrecked on the Welsh coast. To Edward's orderly mind the state of Wales soon became intolerable, and he resolved to incorporate it with England. He forced Llewellyn in the treaty of Conway (1277) to yield four border counties of Wales and proceeded to turn them into English shires, with English laws and customs. A proud, sensitive, and ancient people resisted this attack upon their customs, but Llewellyn perished in an obscure skirmish, and Edward captured his brother David, who suffered at Shrewsbury, in 1283, the heretofore unheard of and awful penalty of being drawn to the scaffold, hanged, beheaded, disembowelled, and quartered. In the following year Edward annexed Wales to the crown of England and divided it into shires after the English model, leaving undisturbed such Welsh customs as did not conflict with English law. In the border lands of Wales—the marches—he placed English lords with excep-

tional powers. It happened that his heir was born in Wales, and in time he made the young Edward Prince of Wales in place of the dead Llewellyn. Ever since the title has usually been conferred upon the heir to the English crown.

The struggle in Wales was that of a people for their life as a distinct race. Edward found a different situation in Scotland. The great nobles were, like those of England, of Norman blood, and had little in common with the barbaric Celtic chieftains of the Highlands. Time and time again, since the Norman Conquest, kings of Scotland had acknowledged themselves vassals of the kings of England, but it was claimed rather for lands held in England than for the kingdom of Scotland itself. In 1286 the last representative of the old Scottish royal line was Margaret, a sickly child, three years old, daughter of Eric, King of Norway, by Margaret, a Scottish princess. Edward saw in a marriage of this Scottish heiress with his own heir, Edward, the way to a peaceful union of the two kingdoms. The project found favour in Scotland, and Edward sent a stately ship to Norway to bring home the infant bride. A wise political scheme was balked by the rough North Sea: the poor child died of seasickness on the journey, and at

once appeared a swarm of claimants to the Scottish throne, who agreed at length to let Edward decide the question. A special court examined the rival claims for more than a year. John Balliol and Robert Bruce, both of Norman descent, and both as much Englishmen as Scots, had the best title, and Edward awarded the crown in the end to Balliol, the undoubted legal heir. He did homage to Edward as overlord; Scotland accepted him and for a time there was peace.

A hundred years before Edward, his great grandfather, Henry II, had begun to reform the laws, but the work

Edward's
policy in
Scotland.

Edward, as
arbitrator, gives
the throne of
Scotland to
Balliol, 1292.

was incomplete and English society had now outgrown the simple needs of an earlier age. When Henry III died

Edward plans a complete reform of the English laws.

the written laws of England consisted chiefly of but four documents (one of them the Great Charter), which could be read through in half an hour. To supplement them were

the ancient customs and usages of the realm, known by us as "the Common Law," interpreted by the king's justices and undergoing incessant change and renewal. Edward's legal mind found the system inadequate. There were unsolved issues affecting the Church, the rights of feudal lords, the levying of taxes, the paying of soldiers; judges were corrupt and the barons sometimes arrogant and defiant. Within a year of his coronation Edward began the work of legal reform, and pursued his aims

The Statute of Westminster the First, 1275.

with unchanging energy and resolution. In 1275 the famous Statute of Westminster the First, almost a code of law in itself, was enacted. Bishop Burnell was Edward's chief adviser, but was assisted by other jurists; the age was one of reorganization and legal definition, and the work of its lawyers still commands respect. Year after year Edward passed complicated statutes reforming abuses, checking claims that impaired the royal supremacy, and classifying laws and customs.

Though no foe of the Church, Edward checked her power. Supported by Parliament, he firmly refused to

Edward checks the power of the Church.

ask the Pope's opinion or to accept the Pope's judgment in regard to his temporal rights.

The Church was steadily accumulating land. Dying men to secure prayers for their souls left her their possessions. Great families died out and their lands passed to others, but the Church never relaxed her hold upon anything, and it was seriously feared by some that she might in time acquire most of the land of England. To check a growing danger, Parliament passed in 1279

the Statute of Mortmain, which simply forbade any further acquisition of land by corporations like the Church or the guilds. Edward taxed the clergy mercilessly. Pope Boniface VIII, in 1296, by the bull *Clericis laicos*, forbade laymen to exact and the clergy to pay taxes on Church property, without his special consent, on pain of excommunication. But Edward's wants were pressing, and he was ready to coerce even the Church. He promptly outlawed and seized the property of the clergy who refused to pay what he demanded; among them was the Archbishop of Canterbury, who, deprived of his vast possessions, was forced to live for a time as a simple village priest upon the alms of the people.

We find Edward busy in every sphere where reform seemed to be needed. His Statute of Gloucester of 1278

aimed to establish a uniform system of justice, and ordered inquiry into the rights of jurisdiction which the barons claimed and abused. Edward's commissioners went about

the country, under writs of *quo warranto*, inquiring into the barons' titles to their lands, and it looked as if he had thoughts of confiscating those of which the title was defective. Some of the barons took alarm; Earl Warrenne showed a rusty sword to Edward's officers and declared that by that ancient title his ancestors had won, and by it he would hold, his possessions. Such talk was empty bravado; but Edward, though hard pressed for money, made no serious attack on baronial rights. He did indeed something to protect the lands of baronial families. His

Statute of Westminster the Second, passed in 1285, established the system of entail which has ever since been so marked a feature of property holding in England. By this enactment estates might be granted so that the owner had only a life tenancy, and the property must pass at his death

to the next heir: lands thus remained in the same family from generation to generation, and great houses were made sure and permanent in their possessions. If Edward thus helped the baronage, it was not the less he who rang the death-knell of their feudal independence. The Statute *Quia Emptores* of 1290 provided that when a part of an estate was sold the feudal dues were to be paid by the new owner, not to the vendor, but to the original lord of the whole estate, who was usually the king. Thus a baron could no longer by sales of land insure for himself a body of retainers devoted to him rather than to the king. Surely but slowly the law worked out its result by checking the creation of new feudal rights and strengthening the royal power.

To chronicle the details of Edward's acts would fill a volume. He passed in 1283 a Statute of Merchants to aid traders to recover debts; he made strict laws against thieving and other crimes, and his zeal for purging his kingdom led to the cruel expulsion of the Jews. They had long been hated. Prejudice believed them guilty of every form of vice, even of the senseless murder of Christian children as a part of their worship. Their chief trade was money-lending, and in days when the interest on loans ranged from thirty to sixty per cent. prudent Jews soon grew rich; but they had no political rights, and were by law the king's chattels. Under Richard I there was a general massacre of Jews; John plundered them as he plundered every one in his power; they repeatedly suffered at Henry III's hands. In 1278, Edward in a single day seized all the Jews in the kingdom on the charge of tampering with the coinage; two hundred and sixty-seven were executed in London alone, and a great multitude elsewhere. Final judgment was still deferred, but in 1290 the last blow fell. Clergy and laity were jealous of Jewish prosperity, and in return for a special grant of money Edward agreed to banish all

Expulsion of the
Jews, 1290.

Jews from the kingdom. Thousands of these unhappy people were driven out, and some of the ships carrying them were wilfully wrecked so that many perished. They took with them their personal property, but their houses, synagogues, and other real property passed to the crown. For centuries the law allowed no Jew to live in England, though a few probably remained in the country, and not until 1655 was Edward's legislation revoked in effect by Cromwell.

The nation was becoming self-conscious, and Edward had the task of reconciling the royal power with the new political aspirations of his people. His wars and schemes of conquest left him always hard pressed for money and he found that as a matter of simple business he could get more money from his people with than without their consent. Now from the towns and shires, now from the barons, now from the Church he asked help. Sometimes his agents went from place to place demanding grants, but usually he called together those whom he designed to tax. His parliaments seem chaotic. At times only the barons, then only the clergy, are summoned; again it is the clergy and representatives of the towns and counties, without the barons; sometimes neither the clergy nor barons, but only the commons are called. Edward brought together those of whom he expected help at the time, but it was inevitable that a system under which burdens were equally divided should soon appear. He deliberately adopted the maxim that "what concerns all must be approved by all," and when he wished to tax the whole nation he asked those who could speak for the nation to meet him. In 1295 he held a great parliament in which every class was represented. Earls and barons, bishops and other church dignitaries were summoned in person; the sheriffs were ordered to see that two knights came from each shire and two citizens from each town; the lower clergy sent repre-

Edward extends
political power
to the middle
classes.

sentatives from each chapter and diocese, and the Parliament of 1295 is called the Model Parliament as representing the whole nation. Apparently all sat in one great assembly, but the clergy soon preferred to sit separately in what was called Convocation, and the nobles and churchmen who were summoned in person by Edward, and whose heirs and successors secured the same right, in time sat also in a separate chamber, and formed what is now known as the House of Lords, while the members chosen by the counties and boroughs formed under Edward's grandson the House of Commons.

Edward, by inheritance not only King of England but also Duke of Aquitaine, was as such feudal vassal of the French king. France was anxious to drive him out of Aquitaine and causes of dispute were not hard to find. He spent much time in his continental dominions. To check French designs he entered into alliance with German, Spanish, and Italian rulers, and their union against the designs of France anticipated the system of alliances of to-day. Scotland joined France, and Edward's most anxious moments were spent, his most urgent demands upon his people were made, to check this ominous combination, but it endured for fully three hundred years. Edward not unnaturally called upon his English subjects to support the claims of their king in France. The Earls of Norfolk and Hereford denied point-blank that he had any right to order them to take part in his foreign designs. He threatened that they should "go or hang"; but the earls took up arms, and he was forced, as often before, to change his plans and to raise money to pay hired soldiers.

In old age Edward was a stern, embittered, and disappointed man, and his excessive levies of taxes turned the hearts of the people against him. When his wife Eleanor died in 1290 he mourned her passionately, and was the worse man for her loss; about the same time, too, he lost

Edward's plans
for his
continental
dominions.

others of his close friends and helpers. His last years were clouded, most of all by war with Scotland. Balliol,

Edward's old
age and war
upon Scotland.

whom he had placed on the Scottish throne, proved a restless vassal, and finally, in

March, 1296, dared to renounce his homage to Edward. But within three months Edward had seized him and his kingdom. Scotland was conquered, but her sensitive and high-spirited nobles and people were soon stung to madness by the misrule of Edward's agents; and William Wallace, a brave and determined leader, headed a revolt in May, 1297, and drove the English back. Then Edward himself went to Scotland and defeated Wallace with the slaughter, it was said, of 20,000 Scots at Falkirk (July 22, 1298). For nearly six years the stern old king carried on the war, meting out to those opposing him the punishment of rebels and traitors, who had taken up arms against their lawful lord, as he now claimed to be. Wallace himself fell into

Edward's hands and was hanged, drawn, and quartered.

By 1305 Scotland was subdued, Edward's home affairs were prosperous, and France seemed no longer hostile.

Edward's last
campaign

against the
Scots. Edward's
death, 1307.

Suddenly a new revolt broke out in Scotland.

Balliol had proved a weak king; now Robert Bruce, the next claimant, led the Scots with skill and courage and was crowned king on

March 27, 1306. Edward was old and ill but he swore to crush Bruce without mercy. He went north to Carlisle, whence he directed the contest with such skill that Bruce was soon a refugee. In March, 1307, the English Parliament met at Carlisle, and when its session was



ELEANOR, WIFE OF
EDWARD I (D. 1290).

From her tomb.

ended the king mounted his horse and tried to lead his army as he had led it in days gone by. But he was dying.



ROBERT BRUCE (1274-1329).

During three laborious days he was able to ride only six miles, and on July 7, 1307, at Borough-on-Sands, near Carlisle, thoroughly worn out, Edward died at the age of sixty-eight; no other English king had lived so long. His dying wishes were that his heart should be sent to the Holy Land, with one hundred knights to fight for the Holy Sepulchre, that his son Edward should continue the war against the Scots, and that his bones might be carried at the head

of the army until Scotland was subdued. The unworthy son abandoned the war, and sent his father's body with scant ceremony to Westminster.

Edward failed to do the things that perhaps he most desired. Jerusalem was never rescued; Scotland was not

Edward's
work.

conquered, but rather was aroused to a new patriotism in resisting the English foe. Yet he wrought better than he dreamed, for he gave England a form of government in which the interests of all classes were so united that it still endures, and almost every great state of the present time has adopted his model.

SUMMARY OF DATES

Richard I went on crusade in 1190, he was captured by Leopold of Austria in 1192 and not liberated until 1194. Meanwhile the barons at home showed their power by **deposing his justiciar, William Longchamp, in 1191.** To check French designs in Normandy, in 1197 Richard built in a single year the enormous Château Gaillard, but John lost it in 1204 and Normandy was finally severed from England. In **1208** the Pope placed England under an **Interdict**, which ended

only in **1213** with John's becoming the vassal of the Pope. John lost **Bouvines in 1214** and his own barons forced him to sign the **Great Charter in 1215**. The French invasion of 1216 was checked by John's death in the same year. Henry III did little of moment until Simon de Montfort and other barons forced him to restrict his authority by the **Provisions of Oxford in 1258**. Civil war soon followed. Simon de Montfort summoned knights of the shire to a Parliament in 1264, but he was himself killed in the battle of Evesham in 1265. The **Dictum of Kenilworth in 1266** restored Henry's power. Edward I enacted the **First Statute of Westminster in 1275**, that of **Mortmain in 1279**, that of **Westminster II, founding entails, in 1285**, and the Statute **Quia Emptores in 1290**. His wars with Wales, begun in 1276, did not end until 1294, after three successive outbreaks. Edward **banished the Jews in 1290**. Margaret of Scotland died in the same year and the disputes about the succession began. **The first complete Parliament** in which clergy, lords and commons sat **was held in 1295**. The Scottish war broke out in 1296, and Edward defeated the Scots in the battle of Falkirk in 1298. The Scots made **Robert Bruce their king in 1306**, and Edward died in 1307 while invading Scotland.

BOOKS FOR REFERENCE

* Stubbs, *The Early Plantagenets* (1886); * Prothero, *The Life of Simon de Montfort* (1877); Hutton, *Misrule of Henry III* (1887), (extracts from contemporary sources); * Tout, *Edward I* (1893); Jenks, *Edward Plantagenet, the English Justinian* (1902); * Stephens, *History of the English Church, from 1066 to the close of the thirteenth century* (1901).

CHAPTER VIII

English Civilization in the Thirteenth Century

THE age presents one chief contrast with the present day; for trade, which furnishes a chief stimulus in modern life, plays a small, if a growing, part in mediæval England. Interests connected with the Church pervaded and dominated society. The tithe—the enforced payment by all classes for the Church's support of a fixed proportion, usually one tenth,

The importance of the Church in mediæval life.



PRIESTS, THIRTEENTH CENTURY.

of the produce of the soil—gave the Church an abundant revenue. Bishops were, besides, great landed proprietors, and monasteries like St. Albans held numerous manors and had thousands of labourers in their service. Though the higher clergy ranked with the barons and often played a great part

in public life, the position of the parish priest was less dignified than we might imagine. He was usually appointed by the lord of the manor, and was not entirely supreme in the parish, for the people had a real voice in

its administration. The church was generally built at their expense, they chose the churchwardens charged with its finances, and in the annual parish

The parish priest.

meeting were free to discuss its affairs. The priest's duty was to sing mass, to baptize,

confess, marry, and bury his parishioners. He preached rarely and might never deliver a sermon in the whole course of his ministry. Occasionally a priest had a wife, but as the Church condemned this, a married priest lost respect. If permitted to say grace for and to dine with the lord of the manor, the priest was often treated as an inferior, sitting with the dependents below a great salt-cellar placed on the table, while those of higher rank—the lord, his family, and friends—sat above it. Often, in-

The Church promotes freedom.

deed, the priest was of servile origin. A villein's son, once ordained by a bishop, was

free; many a villein sent his son to school to learn to read in the hope of his being ultimately ordained, and the Church helped in this way to recruit the ranks of the free.


The monasteries, so important an element in the life of the time, were in theory, and some of them were in fact, homes of prayer. To them men and

Life in the monasteries.

women who desired a quiet life retired for the peace and security of which they could be

certain nowhere else; they gave up all their property and took solemn vows to live a chaste life and obey those in authority. A convent, the term including houses both of men and of women, was organized on the principle of a life in common. Its members met in the church at least six or seven times a day for prayer; they took their meals, they shared their employments together, and daily in the chapter-house they confessed their faults in each other's presence and were duly punished. In such a life there was really little privacy, and a well-regulated monastery was a scene of busy industry. Its abbot was occupied with

the affairs of, perhaps, a dozen manors and passed from one to the other often in considerable state, and the monastery had a hierarchy of officials—a prior, precentor, cellarer, chamberlain, etc.—whose duties were exacting and



NORMAN MONASTERY.

Conjectural restoration of Kirkstall Abbey as in 1190.

who were obliged to keep accurate accounts of every farthing which they spent. To each monk was assigned his task; he taught in the monastery school, or worked in the garden, or wrote the precious chronicles which are our chief sources of information for the life of mediæval England, or shared in the other industries of a great and self-contained household. The monastery often had a considerable body of lay workmen—its millers, shoemakers, carpenters, tailors, and blacksmiths—and it spent vast revenues upon building. The life had its own excitements. There were lawsuits with the bishop in regard to exemptions from his authority; towns grew up on monastery lands, and then dues were to be collected and rights

to be defined; there were appeals, sometimes to the king, sometimes to Rome. The monks journeyed far on the business of the convent, and thus saw something of the world, and they also received in the convent travellers, who brought to them the news of the day.

Life in the monastery was thus often far removed from the quiet that devotees may have wished. The claims of

Corruption and
reform in the
monasteries.

the world were sometimes too fully recognised.

Abbots lived in great state and learned

worldly ambitions and amusements; monks

often fell into laxity and vice. From time to time reformers attacked the prevailing abuses. At Cluny, in

the twelfth century, began a reform of the old Benedictine rule, and stricter living was enforced in the hundreds of Cluniac houses. When Cluny itself

fell away, the Cistercians played the rôle of reformers, but they, too, in time declined. Even at their best the monks deemed it no part of their duty to reform the world, aiming rather to for-

get it wholly; but early in

the thirteenth century a

new zeal to help the needy

appeared, when Francis of

Assisi and his followers,

The mendicant
movement.

Francis of
Assisi and
Dominic.

who called themselves friars or brothers, went about Italy preaching in the market-places and village streets. They devoted themselves

to lepers and others of the suffering and neglected classes. Dominic, a Spaniard, began about the same time a similar movement.

The friars took vows to remain poor and to beg for the means to live. They began work

in England in the early days of Henry III, and through their zeal and purity quickly won great influence. By

Dominicans
in England,
1221.
Franciscans,
1224.



CISTERCIAN MONK.

caring for disease, they gave a stimulus to the study of medicine, and they were not tied by the monks' routine of duties, but free to go from place to place. Though before half a century passed they, too, became corrupted, they were even then, perhaps, better than their age.

The Conqueror neither gave nor sold land to his followers, but, in the fashion of the time, granted it to them, subject

The principles of feudal tenure. to conditions of feudal service to himself. The leaders, who secured hundreds of

manors, were required to take solemn oath to be loyal to the king and in proportion to their holdings to furnish him with fighting men for his wars. Under feudal tenure the nation was, indeed, a great family, bound by something like family ties to the king. His vassals

were required to give him special help when his eldest son was knighted, his eldest daughter married, or he himself was taken captive. A tenant of the king who proved a coward in the day of battle, or otherwise unfaithful, forfeited his lands; when a tenant-in-chief died, his heir succeeded only after securing from the king the right; if he died without an heir, the king resumed possession of the property; if the heir was a minor, the king appointed a guardian; if the successor was an unmarried woman, the king nominated a husband for her, since only a man could do the required military service; when the vassal wished to transfer his holding to another, the king demanded a fine for granting the right. Thus at every turn the landholder came face to face with the king's authority. Ordinarily, the king's revenues from his own land and the dues, fees, and fines pertaining to his jurisdic-



FRIAR, THIRTEENTH CENTURY.

tion sufficed for his support. But for special purposes, such as war, he was obliged to levy taxes, and Edward I established the principle that this should be done only with the consent of those who had to pay. The burden of taxation was at times almost intolerable. We find Edward I forcing the clergy to pay him the half of a year's income, and other classes suffered in the same proportion. The lord

The king
ordinarily
"lives of his
own."

was responsible to the sovereign for the taxes upon his estates, and had to force those beneath him to pay. His jurisdiction went as far, in earlier times, as the power of life and death, and in the days of Stephen some of the barons even coined their own money and levied private war.

The heavy
burden of
taxation.

A new code of honour that appears in this age united the upper classes in courteous and helpful relations.

When chivalry first began we do not know, but it was strongest during the crusading era. Then the great knightly orders were founded: the Knights Templars, the Knights Hospitalers, and the Teutonic Knights. From the early age of

The principles
of chivalry.



ARMING A KNIGHT.

The king is girding on the sword, other knights are putting on his spurs.

seven the aspirant to knighthood served some other knight as page, cleaned his armour and weapons, sometimes even

groomed his horse and performed other menial services. At fourteen he chose a lady as the special object of his devotion, and received the consecrated sword of an esquire. To his service as a knight he was finally ordained by a ritual not unlike that which made a priest. After fasting, prayer, and confession of his

The
apprenticeship
to knighthood.

sins, he
partook
of the
sacrament, had his
sword blessed by the



KNIGHTHOOD CONFERRED ON THE FIELD OF BATTLE, THE ADVERSARY BEING OVERTHROWN.

priest, was then formally arrayed in armour and made his solemn vows. To be loyal to God and the king, to be true in all his undertakings, to prefer honour to gain, to be pure, to reverence purity in women and to serve them, were among the pledges of the knight. Chivalry was a league among those of gentle blood, and its obligations did not extend to the lower classes; but it was in itself a lofty code for an age of brute force; it helped to make war more merciful and to keep high ideals before the mind. The king, the nobility, even the higher clergy, had power to make knights, and in time nearly every layman of gentle blood ranked as a knight.

Chivalry a
league among
the upper
classes.

If history were only the record of the work of governments, we should keep our eyes in this age on kings and barons only, for by them the state was ruled. But the condition of the thousands of labourers upon the manors is of vital interest to us. A manor usually contained five or six thousand

The labourers
on the manor.

acres, and the manor-house, where dwelt the lord of the manor, or his steward, was the centre of its life. Every three weeks its hall was the scene of a court in which neg-

The court of the manor. lect of duty, payments, questions of weights and measures, and other business of the manor came up for judgment, and the lord of

the manor had sometimes criminal jurisdiction, even to the extent of the death penalty. What we may call "the home farm" of the manor, the demesne, was retained by the lord himself. Often he had slaves who rendered him personal services as required, but most of the labour on the manor was done by freemen or by villeins. Of these the freeman paid a fixed rent, usually in labour; he could not be disturbed so long as he paid it, and he might come and go as he chose. We may believe, however, that in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries there were comparatively few freemen on the manors, and that those who tilled the soil were chiefly the unfree dwellers in the villages (vills)


The freemen and villeins on the manor. who were known as villeins. The mediæval labourer lived, not like the farmer in America, on the land which each cultivated, but in a

village, where the cottages stood close together, and were some distance perhaps from the scene of toil. A manor was usually cultivated on what is known as the three-field system, the arable land being divided into three great open fields each having in one year a crop sown in the autumn, in the next one sown in the spring, and in the third lying fallow. The tillage was rude.

The terms on which the soil was cultivated. Teams of four, eight, or even twelve oxen dragged huge wooden ploughs, which turned

but a shallow furrow; the value of fertilizing was little understood, and the soil produced not more than one-third of what the same acreage would yield at the present time. Though the villein had sometimes only a cottage and a garden he usually cultivated for himself about thirty acres, which were often to be found in as many strips scattered

over the whole area of the manor. The manor was, indeed, one huge farm, and those upon it were knit together by very close ties. Sometimes the villeins were jointly re-



GETTING IN THE HARVEST (FOURTEENTH CENTURY).—MOUNTING A HILL.

Note the wheel.

sponsible for their service to the lord, and they thus had every motive to urge each other to efficiency. The duties varied on different manors. In winter and summer months a villein usually gave his master about three days'

The amount of labour required from the villein.

labour in each week, but at harvest-time the amount often increased to four, and a villein was, indeed, obliged sometimes to hire other labourers to help him discharge his duty to his lord at this busy season.- He had for his reward the product of his own land, and thus was inspired by a tenant's or owner's motives to thrift and care.

Though the villein was thus not a mere slave his condition was servile and his children inherited it; once a vil-

The servile condition of the villein.

lein always a villein. He could not leave the manor and his lord might force him to give up one holding for another and to assume new duties. He had no rights of property against his lord, who on a villein's death took his possessions; he could not name a successor to his holding; if he desired to send his son to school, or to allow his daughter to

marry, he must pay the lord for the right; if he made a bargain, he must get his lord's consent; on the increase of his cattle he must pay to the lord a percentage; he must grind his corn at his lord's mill, and pay what fee the lord charged; at seasons like Easter and Christmas he was sometimes obliged to make presents of eggs and poultry to his master. Yet the villein's condition, though unfree, was probably better than we should suppose. His lord might not

The degree of liberty enjoyed by the villein. injure him in life or limb. What he made by his holding belonged in practice to himself, and often from his profits he was able to purchase his own freedom. His land, too, passed usually to his own kin, and questions between him and his lord were settled in the manorial court, in which a jury of tenants gave judgment. The lord's relations to his villeins were regulated by varying custom. On some manors the villeins were little short of freemen; on others a harsh master could make their lot wretched. The chief drawback in

The disadvantages of the villein compared with the freeman. the villein's service was its uncertainty. The freeman knew exactly what was required of him; the villein did not know on one day what service might be demanded the next.

In early mediæval society money was little used, and exact values were not placed upon services, but as time went on the commercial spirit developed, and greater precision came into the relations on the manor; then the villeins' duties were more strictly defined, and they came to differ less and less from those of the freemen. Some freemen, indeed, took villeins' holdings and discharged their duties, while some villeins performed the services of freemen, and the sharp distinction between free and servile tended to disappear. By the end of the thirteenth century it was weakened; by the end of the fourteenth, as we shall see, it was almost gone.

Other industries besides farming flourished in the village, which was largely self-contained. The housewife

made the homespun for clothing; the peasant built his own wattled cabin; the village tanner, bootmaker, smith, and carpenter plied their trades. Only for building the village church or the lord's castle was much outside help required, and local labour and skill appear to have sufficed even for them in a way that we should hardly suspect. The beautiful wood carving and stained glass, the engraving on the monumental brasses, even the casting of the bells, found then, or a little later, in almost every church, were achieved by local labour, we hardly know how. The amazing building energy of the Normans must have stimulated the trades affected by it, and to this extent widened the range of village industry.

There was little room in the manorial village for others than those sharing permanently in its work, and the surplus population must have found the conditions of life hard. A landless man was apt to be seized and enslaved by some lawless noble. The life even of those whose lot was happier was wretched enough. Their dirty hovels, covered with turf or thatch, were without floor, chimney, or window. Apparently fuel was abundant on account of the many stretches of forest, and the dwellers crouched in cold weather about a fire on the bare ground, and at bedtime probably threw themselves on straw in the corner in a manner hardly superior to that of an American Indian in his wigwam. Though gin and rum were still unknown, the peasant was often sodden with beer, upon the brewing and selling of which there was apparently no restriction. The life had no doubt its joyous side. England was called "merry" as early as in the reign of Henry I. Village feasts and sports had their own charms for simple-minded and unlettered men, but the diversions were few and the peasant's cheerless life was degraded by brutal tastes and habits.

The village industries.

Conditions of life in the mediæval village.

Crime was rife in mediæval England and justice long irregular. Though the Conqueror placed the clergy under the Bishops' Courts, he disturbed the criminal law but little. The chief landholders and the Hundred and the County Courts, all had criminal jurisdiction. After Stephen's lawless days Henry II found these courts in chaos. His aim was to bring the more serious criminal cases under his own authority and in time his sheriffs presided in the County Courts and his trained justices travelled up and down the land. The old system was not wholly swept away but the Hundred Court rapidly declined, and then the County Court became of chief importance, though many great lords continued to try criminals. So common was the death penalty that the gallows and the gibbet, with their ghastly array, were found on nearly every large estate. But the king had every selfish motive to check the power in important affairs of all but his own tribunals, since the goods of those who were hanged or banished by his judgment, or who fled from his justice, became his property. Vast sums passed in this way into the royal coffers.

At a trial the sheriff or justice sat usually in the open air, and about him were the freemen summoned from the


hundreds and villages. Evidence of the guilt or innocence of the accused was not taken as we should take it. There was no weighing of testimony on both sides and trying thus to determine the facts. If the accused swore that he was innocent and other reputable men swore that they believed him, he was acquitted. If he could not secure this help, he went through the ordeal as in the pre-Norman days. The Normans brought with them the practice of trial

Trial by
battle.

by battle. Under this, accuser and accused, armed with weapons like short pickaxes, left the issue to the God of Battles, and fought sometimes for a whole day. The aim of each was not so much to kill

the other as to force him to yield and cry "craven." The accused who pronounced this fatal word was deemed guilty and often executed forthwith. If the accuser failed to make good his charge, he was henceforth disgraced. Trial by jury, which springs from this age, at first differed much from its present form. As the popu-

lation was scanty and the men in each community were well informed of local doings, when any one was accused, his neighbours were summoned to say what they knew about him. They were



JUDICIAL DUEL.

the jury supposed at first to judge from their own knowledge, but in time they heard the evidence of others on points of which they were personally ignorant, and thus the jury as we know it was developed. It was indeed rather as to personal character than as to the facts that the first jurors gave testimony, and many a man was hanged more for his general bad character


than on evidence connecting him with a crime. The ordeal fell into disuse after 1215, and then conviction by

jury was common, though the accused still had the right to refuse this kind of trial.

To force his consent he was sometimes half starved, sometimes heavy weights were placed upon his naked chest until from this "peine forte et dure" he yielded, or perhaps died. Not only in criminal but also in civil cases juries were summoned.

Trial by
jury general
after 1215.

Human life was but little respected, death was the penalty for even trifling theft and there were holocausts of victims; in every year hundreds, perhaps thousands, were hanged. Cattle and horse stealing was then, as it is now in the more unsettled parts of America, a common offence. For baser crimes there was heavier punishment than hanging. The man who tampered with the king's coin was torn to pieces



"ORNAMENTS OF A MEDIEVAL LANDSCAPE."

by horses. By the time of Edward I the subject guilty of treason was hanged until nearly dead; his entrails were then torn out while he was still alive and burned before his face, and he was finally beheaded; it was further provided that his head should be exposed in some public place and the four quarters of his body sent to as many different towns in England as a terrible warning to others.

When the veil is lifted from the mediæval village, we get a picture of brutal lawlessness that staggers us. Almost by accident we have the records of the Hundred of North Erpingham for the year 1285, and in that year, within a radius of twelve miles, eight men and four women were murdered and three men and two women were killed in fatal frays. The inhabitants of the same region had seen quite recently eleven persons hanged, and one man, for tampering with the king's coin, was torn to pieces by horses. The women were as savage as the men. In this hopeless and wretched

The lawlessness
of mediæval
England.

most by accident we have the records of the
Hundred of North Erpingham for the year
1285, and in that year, within a radius of twelve
miles, eight men and four women were murdered and three
men and two women were killed in fatal frays. The in-
habitants of the same region had seen quite recently
eleven persons hanged, and one man, for tampering with
the king's coin, was torn to pieces by horses. The women
were as savage as the men. In this hopeless and wretched

society self-destruction was common; there were five suicides in this year—two being of women. To prevent outrage at night William the Conqueror introduced into England the use of the curfew: when the church bell rang in the evening the people were to close their doors and not to go forth again. Nevertheless evildoers went abroad in the dark, and it often happened in some lonely house that man and wife, sons and daughters, were murdered and that anything worth taking was carried off. When an evil deed was discovered and the alarm was raised, it was every man's duty to join this "hue and cry" and to track the criminal down if he could. But to secure those who had done their work in the silence of the night was not easy; the peasants were busy with their own toil and so stolid in their ignorance as not to be greatly concerned to aid the cause of justice, and many a brutal crime was unavenged.

The men in each township were divided into groups of ten, called Tithings, and in lieu of police protection, as we know it, these ten were responsible for one another's conduct; they were bound to produce for trial any of their number who might be accused, and were liable to pay for the injury done by any of them, except so far as each could prove his own innocence. The members of the tithing took a formal obligation called the "Frank-pledge" to discharge this police duty. Every villager was required to join a tithing, and it was the business of the court of the hundred or of the manor to see that this was done, since those not under bonds of frank-pledge were suspicious characters. It was difficult for a man to pass from one place to another, for where he was unknown a tithing might not be open to him. The utter lawlessness of some districts shows that the tithing system was no guarantee of order, but in others it was no doubt more successful. The Church's right of

The Tithing
and the Frank-
pledge.

The Church's
right of
sanctuary.

sanctuary often proved friendly to vice. A designing criminal might commit a terrible crime, but if he escaped to a church or churchyard the civil law could not touch him while he remained there. The Church might of course eject him, and he could then be secured, but more usually he was allowed to leave the country under her protection. No doubt many criminals were thus practically banished, but the right of sanctuary encouraged vice and the precincts of churches often became the homes of brutal ruffians who would sally forth, under cover of night, to commit crime and fall back upon the sacred precincts as a refuge.

The Conquest appears to have brought at first something like ruin to the English towns, for the cowed English, who made up the trading classes, had no hope or courage to develop commerce. But Norman rule soon gave better security and order than had been known before. Norman kings held both sides of the English Channel and they could aid English trade to come into touch with continental markets. By the time of Henry I the wool trade was important and gave new life to the towns. They multiplied rapidly, and by the thirteenth century practically all of them were self-governing. Edward I summoned members to Parliament from no less than one hundred and sixty-six towns. But they were tiny places; before 1300 the largest borough in England, outside of London, contained only four or five thousand inhabitants. In the narrow streets reigned indescribable filth and misery; many of the houses were only of mud, with a roof of thatch and reeds, for the wealth and energy of England were in this age spent, not in improving the towns, but in building castles, cathedrals, and monasteries. Tanners, butchers, and mercers were the chief townsmen, and to this day the upper classes in England do not dwell in the towns. The mediæval townsmen had but a humble share in the

The growth of
towns.

life of the nation, and their members of Parliament were long looked down upon by those who sat for the counties.

But London was then, as now, a place apart. London already a place apart.

In the old England, merchants of London had ranked as barons. William the Conqueror found it a city of wooden houses liable to destructive fires. His massive tower of London soon held



A TOWN STREET.

St. Louis of France on his way to church in the early morning received the contents of a basin of dirty water thrown out of a window by a student. Instead of being angry the king rewarded the student for rising early to study. Note that some, if not all, of the windows have no glass.

the sometimes turbulent capital in check and its streets were in time lined with stone edifices; its importance in trade and political life grew, and every great man soon found it necessary to keep a London house. The Conqueror gave London a charter which assured to it privileges and independence that no other place in England at the time possessed.

In the life of the towns the guilds were prominent. By the year 1300 no less than one hundred and fifty

English towns had merchant guilds, with valuable privileges conferred by the king. A merchant guild sometimes controlled the trade of a whole county, and since it allowed a share to none but members there is no wonder that the merchant guilds in time ruled the town and that the Guild Hall became the centre of civic life. Artisans organized their own craft guilds, which excluded all but members from work in the trade concerned, and sometimes the craft guilds were at war with the merchant guilds, as the producer is often still at war with the middleman. No doubt, the guilds, strong in their privileges, were selfish and tyrannical and prevented many an honest worker from securing employment. But the freedom from competition removed the temptation to do bad work, and there was strict supervision and a persistent demand for good measure and good quality. The guilds, too, served useful functions as benefit and insurance societies and they aided education; to this day some of them survive in London and use their abundant revenues for the public benefit.

The same system of privilege that protected the English trader also protected the foreigners residing in England. The house, or guild, of German traders had by the reign of Henry III what was in reality a fortress in London known as the Steelyard. It was inclosed by a wall; it had its great hall like a mediæval castle; its members had each his coat of armour and the strong gates closed at curfew. Such elaborate military provision indicates a certain insecurity; but by the time of Edward I this was passing away, for the nation as a whole was now too much concerned with trade and industry to leave them to the caprices of rival monopolists. Parliament assumed control of trade matters, and the old, irregular, and unequal dues gave way to the national customs. In earlier times pirates had preyed upon English

The Guilds.

Foreign traders
in England.

Edward I's
attention to
trade.

commerce, but Edward I took special pains to make the seas secure and to extend and increase the continental markets for English wares. He improved quays and harbours and declared himself the master of the Channel. The expulsion of the Jews in his reign was largely due to the growing confidence of the English, as a trading people, in their own financial capacity, but the exports were still chiefly the products of the sea, the farm, or the mine—flesh and fish, wool and hides, lead and tin; in manufactures England had as yet no important place. The wares not locally

Peddlers and
fairs.

produced were either bought from travelling peddlers or were distributed by means of the fairs held sometimes annually, sometimes three or four times in the year. The great annual fair at Stourbridge, which lasted for three weeks in every September, rivalled that of Novgorod in Russia. To it came sellers and buyers from all parts of England and from almost every country in Europe. Monasteries, barons, townsmen, and others who could afford it, secured at the fairs the year's supplies of spices, wines, clothing, furs, and other commodities, and the chief product which the foreign traders carried away was the English wool, already in the thirteenth century highly esteemed.

There was much travel in mediæval England. The king, the great lords, abbots and bishops, and the stewards in their service, went constantly from manor to manor,



PILGRIM, THIRTEENTH CENTURY.

The usual outdoor dress.


often carrying considerable sums of money. To enable the king to live on the spot off the produce of his many estates, the court was necessarily migratory.

The extent
of travel.

Pilgrimage, too, was a devout fashion of the age. Besides the monasteries, which received travellers, there were many inns. Since in the wet seasons of the year the roads were bad, and, for want of bridges, streams had sometimes to be forded, travellers were restricted to the saddle.

The main highways were reasonably secure, but there were great stretches of forest, and in these the lawless element found refuge. Even if only accused of crime, a man who failed to appear when summoned five times in the County Court, was outlawed; then he could be hanged without trial wherever found. Such outlaws fled to the waste places of the country, and in real life were less picturesque than Robin Hood appears in fiction. The law which condemned them was often unjust, and they revenged themselves upon society by robbery and violence.


The most striking external change which the Norman conquerors wrought in England was in architecture. They showed a profound contempt for the primitive English



PART OF NORMAN NAVE,
DURHAM CATHEDRAL, ABOUT 1130.

structures, often of wood, and soon the Norman castle rose everywhere, and Norman bishops and Norman abbots, who supplanted Englishmen, set about re-
 building their cathedrals and abbeys. Hundreds of new churches were built; the diocese of Oxford alone has to this day two hundred and forty churches begun within a hundred years of the Conquest. The Norman's buildings were massive. He used the round Roman arch, but his work was rougher, his walls were thicker, his pillars heavier than those of Rome. He could not make the Roman mortar that has in some cases outlasted the stones which it held together, his masonry was wide-jointed and bad, and at first his primitive carving was done with an axe. But the Norman work im-

The Norman
architecture.




NORMAN DOORWAY, IFFLEY, ABOUT 1140.

Note the elaborate ornament.

proved rapidly. Taught, perhaps, by the returning crusaders, who had seen better architecture in other lands, the Norman builder soon matured his style to its fullest

beauty, and the lavish ornament, which he bestowed on even tiny country churches, surprises us still; in vast structures like Durham Cathedral and in small ones like Iffley Church, the same wealth of care and toil is to be found. We wonder how villages could bear the cost of the many beautiful parish churches; but the bishop had the power to order the erection of churches, and villagers must somehow obey. It was they who built the churches; probably not often did a great man or monastery furnish the means to erect a village church.



EARLY ENGLISH FRONT, STRIXTON,
ABOUT 1220.

Note the narrow undecorated windows.

The devotion to the round-arched Norman

The beginning
of Gothic
architecture.

architecture continued for a hundred years, but when in 1174 Canterbury Cathedral was partly destroyed by fire the architect who rebuilt it made great use of the pointed arch. The style

From about
1215.


was wholly new and was called in derision "Gothic," after the early barbarian conquerors of Italy. But the convenience and beauty of this style were quickly recognised, and from the reign of John the buildings in England for a hundred years are in this "Early English" style. New types of mouldings and ornaments, clustered shafts and delicately carved foliage, soon appeared. The high and pointed arches and long and narrow windows carried the eye upward, while

the Norman horizontal lines kept it down to solid earth. Beautiful as was the "Early English" style, it too developed and changed into what is known as the "Decorated" style. The windows became wider and were adorned with brilliant painted glass, one of the fine products of the age. In these wider windows the stone-work at the head is carried out in beautiful geometrical or flowing forms, and the interior of a church thus shows striking effects both in lines and colour. The Decorated style was itself destined to give way in the fourteenth century to the Perpendicular, in which straight lines and right angles predominate.

Many of the English villages were in the early Norman days dominated by a


rude castle standing on rising ground, if such were to be found. In some cases these strongholds were probably still of wood with earthen defences, but the better ones consisted

The mediæval castle.



EARLY ENGLISH DOORWAY, SKELTON,
ABOUT 1250.


usually of a great square keep, with massive stone walls, sometimes thirty feet thick at the base. Before the days of artillery such a place could hold out as long as its occupants had food and water. It was surrounded by a ditch or moat, filled with water if possible, across which was thrown a drawbridge, lowered in troubled times only to



NAVE, LICHFIELD.—THE EARLY DECORATED STYLE, ABOUT 1250.

Note the geometrical forms in the window-heads.


admit friends. These castles were cramped and comfortless, and the walls were so thick that but little



CHOIR, ELY.—DECORATED STYLE,
ABOUT 1325.


Note the complex tracery in the windows.

light could penetrate through the narrow openings to the tiny rooms. But as the position of the dominant class became secure, the castle improved. Once past the entrance gateway the visitor found himself in a court-yard. On one side was the most important feature, the




DECORATED WINDOW, READING,
ABOUT 1306.

hall, the centre of the castle life, where the lord received his guests, dined with them and his dependents, and



BERKELEY CASTLE (SQUARE NORMAN KEEP), ABOUT 1120.

Edward II was murdered in Berkeley Castle in 1327.



NOTTINGHAM CASTLE, THIRTEENTH CENTURY (RESTORED).

It was here that Mortimer was seized by Edward III.

listened to the minstrels or watched the mountebanks who amused his leisure. There, too, since the castle had but few bed-rooms, his humbler retainers or guests spent the night lying upon straw. On the other sides of the court-yard were the sleeping chambers, the offices, sometimes a chapel. The square Norman keep gave way in the reign of John to the round-tower, and by the time of Edward I we have what is called the Edwardian castle, an elaborate structure with a complicated system of defences. It was entered by an imposing gateway, itself a



HALL, ACTON BURNELL MANOR-HOUSE, THIRTEENTH CENTURY.


The towers at each end were probably for defensive purposes.

tower of defence, and sometimes there were two moats, and a second or third wall to pass before the inner courtyard was reached. Here were to be found at last not merely the hall and the few bed-chambers like cells of the earlier age, but a dwelling-house that in time became comfortable. Such castles were very expensive to build and maintain. They were indeed fortresses with a considerable garrison, and by the end of the thirteenth century most of them were in the king's hands, or in those of a few nobles having his license.

In the manor-house, too, some approach to modern standards had appeared by the time of Edward I. There were rooms with fire-places and large windows, and walls often richly wainscoted. Not yet, however, was it possible to neglect all


The manor-house.

idea of defence. The house was a "moated grange" surrounded by a moat, crossed by a drawbridge; or, if without a moat, it had some provision for defence in time of trouble. Within the house there was but scanty furniture. Visitors were received in the bed-rooms, the host



DRAWBRIDGE.

or hostess sitting sometimes upon the bed, while the guest occupied a chair or a bench. The great hall was strewn with rushes and in it there was little but trestle tables and benches and chairs, as there still is in a college dining-hall. The walls of both bed-rooms and hall were usually hung with tapestry.



CONVERSATION IN THE CHAMBER.

Sculpture, the handmaid of architecture, attained considerable development in England by the thirteenth century, and church buildings were already adorned with many statues. When

Eleanor, wife of Edward I, died, beautiful memorial crosses were erected on the spots where her body had rested for

the night on its sad journey from Lincoln to Westminster, and upon each of these was the effigy of the dead queen. In the churches the sculptured images of the dead lay often upon their tombs. Sculpture and other arts in mediæval England. The English had a passion for accurate portraiture. Other branches of art were developing. Painted glass and frescoes were common by the time of Edward I. Music received much attention, and the harp, the organ, the fiddle, the viol, the zither, and other instruments were in use. Singing, owing to the demand for it in the church services, was, more than it is now, a general accomplishment.

The food-supply of the time was always uncertain. Modern commerce can bring rapidly the resources of distant regions to relieve scarcity in any quarter, Food. but in a mediæval state two bad harvests in succession were sure to cause famine, and famine brought in its wake disease and pestilence. Incessant epidemics carried off so many that for centuries the population appears to have remained stationary. Disease. Leprosy was a common disease; though we hear nothing of leper-houses before the Conquest, there were during the next two centuries as many as fifty in England. In a large place like London the laws of sanitation received more attention than we should perhaps imagine, but in rural districts their neglect, aided by bad food, swelled the death-rate. The graveyards were then, and for long centuries after, in the centres of the towns and villages, and even to modern times the dead were laid uncovered in the vaults of churches. It was found in a village desolated by plague that a naked corpse had been thrown into a hole in the ground and scarcely covered; when the village wisacres thought at last of burning the corpse, the pestilence ceased. There was no medical profession in the modern sense. Scarcely

monk or other cleric would show a taste for the healing art, acquire reputation as a leech, and be called upon in time of need, but the attempts at healing were associated with much quackery. Medicine was thought to be more effective if taken on holy ground, at a shrine, or sacred well. There was no chemical analysis, and herbs were used without a real understanding of their properties. Bloodletting was then, and long after, a favoured relief for disease.

By the time of Edward I ladies wore dresses trailing on the ground, which were the subject of jesting comment. Gentlemen, when not in armour, apparently wore long gowns similar to the present dressing-gown. The peasant's dress consisted of a single garment of homespun or sheepskin, which left

Dress.



RIDING COSTUME,
THIRTEENTH CENTURY.



TRADER,
THIRTEENTH CENTURY.

arms and legs bare and was caught in at the waist by a girdle of leather or rope. Cotton garments were unknown, and linen was expensive. The English imported cloth, especially from Italy, and the crusaders brought back the textures of the East. Brilliant colours and furs were worn by men much more than is now the fashion.

In the days of William Rufus, shoes with long, pointed toes gained an absurd vogue. Vanity went, as ever, to extremes. We hear of women overloaded with jewelry, of tight lacing to improve the figure, of painting the eyes, of fasting and bleeding so as to look delicate, of dyeing the hair the fashionable yellow colour. In the twelfth century ladies wore the hair tied in two long plaits, but by the time of Edward I it was usually gathered up in a net.

The making of arms and of armour must have been an important industry. Most of the fighting of the times was hand to hand, and for this work the Norman warrior was perhaps the best equipped in Europe. Heavy plate armour belongs to a later period; the earlier warrior wore what was called chain mail—a long tunic of leather or cloth covered with

Arms and
armour.



KNIGHT, TWELFTH CENTURY.
Note the huge shield and the long robe of chain armour.



KNIGHT, END OF THIRTEENTH CENTURY.
Note the small shield and the metal plates on the shoulder.

rings or plates of steel; often in one piece with it was a hood drawn over the head. In the left hand he carried a shield, sometimes three or four feet long and decorated

as time went on with his own coat of arms; in his right a spear with a tiny flag or pennant that indicated his rank. At his side hung a sword. Great skill was required to manage his horse and at the same time to use spear and shield with effect. Of the rank and file the best



ARCHER WITH LONG-BOW AND SHEAF
OF ARROWS.



CROSS-BOWMAN
WITH HIS SHIELD ON HIS BACK.

The cross-bow proved much less
effective than the long-bow.

equipped had a short sleeveless tunic of leather or of cloth, a steel cap, and a sword or spear, but we hear of fighting men armed only with axes, scythes, or clubs. The most formidable weapon of the Middle Ages was the long-bow—sometimes six feet in length.

The formidable
long-bow.

Edward I made it the great national weapon, and incessant practice developed in its users remarkable strength and skill. The bowmen shot a steel-pointed arrow which could penetrate four inches of oak, and even plate armour; it is on record that an arrow pierced the mail shirt, the mail breeches, the thigh and the wooden saddle of a rider, and sank deep into his horse's flank. To kill a horse with such a weapon was

comparatively easy. The fire of the long-bow was more rapid than that of the musket of a later time; it was deadly at a range of two hundred yards or more, and there was no smoke to obscure the archer's aim. With this weapon in his hand the English archer was soon superior to the mounted knight.

The amusements of the age were often rough and cruel. There was cock-fighting in school-rooms under the master's eye. For the public amusement **Amusements.** wild boars fought and dogs baited bulls and bears. The populace of London flocked to the suburbs on a Sunday afternoon to the sham fights and tournaments in which hard blows were struck. On the water there was tilting from boats at a target, with a penalty of a ducking to him who missed. Even on the ice a favourite sport was for two adversaries on a rude forerunner of the modern skate to rush at and try to strike down each other with long poles; and broken arms, heads, or legs were the frequent results of such struggles. Football was a favourite game of the time. There were running, leaping, and wrestling matches. Riding, tilting, hawking, dancing, games of bowls and chess, were among the amusements of the upper classes. Ladies had their spinning and embroidery, their birds, dogs, and gardens.

Excessive indulgence in eating was so common that the number of dishes to be served at a meal was limited by statute. At table it was customary to cut **Table manners.** the desired portion from the meat that was offered and lay it on a slice of bread; there were no plates or forks; food was carried to the mouth by the fingers, and the piece of bread which had served as a plate was either eaten at the close of the meal or thrown into a basket for the poor. Careful people washed their hands both before and after a meal. In a great place like London there were public eating-houses. From the

coarse conversation that was common at table modern refinement would probably turn in disgust. The fun

and humour of the time, like its quieter amusements, were associated with religion.

Mystery plays depicting scenes from the Bible were very popular, and revelry consisted usually in parodying the mass or other religious rites, in bringing a donkey into the church choir, or throwing dice upon the high altar. Grotesque carving in the churches sometimes perpetuates to this day a clerical jester's attempts to make his associates ridiculous.


Few of the people of England could read during this period, but the age saw a marked advance in education, for in it appear the universities. They were a natural growth. Books were few and dear, and those wishing to learn were obliged to sit at the feet

of some living teacher of reputation like Abelard. A central place like Paris had many teachers. The term university (*universitas*) means only a corporation or guild, and at Paris the mas-

ters formed such a university or society, which in time gained the control of the conditions on which the bishop's chancellor might grant a license to teach. The students




CHAPEL OF MERTON COLLEGE, OXFORD, BUILT ABOUT 1290. DECORATED STYLE.



BOOK-CASE WITH CHAINED BOOKS, HEREFORD CATHEDRAL.

at Bologna in Italy first organized such a union; they came from many countries and their combination in a



A THIRTEENTH CENTURY
PROFESSOR.

Note the hood then used
as a head-dress.

university enabled them to regulate prices for rooms, books, and other charges; they employed the professors, and sometimes imposed upon them a severe discipline. But the word university came in time to mean a body which regulated studies at a seat of learning. Not only young men flocked to these centres; beneficed clergymen, even bishops, came to learn from the lips of a famous teacher, or, as scandal said, to enjoy the freedom of life possible in a populous centre. Oxford seems to have been founded before the end of the twelfth century by a migration from Paris. Henry II was usually at war with the French king, and at one time by the threat of loss of

revenues summoned home Englishmen studying at Paris. Cambridge University is of somewhat later origin than Oxford.

Students multiplied rapidly. Three thousand are said to have deserted Oxford in 1208 owing to a quarrel with the town, which made terms and the students came back. Most of them were mere boys, and they lived not in stately colleges, but in bare and desolate lodgings without artificial heat or light, or the commonest comforts of modern life. In the evenings the students, ripe for mischief or violence, flocked into the narrow streets. Those of high rank had with them quarrelsome retainers, and no doubt old local jealousies and rivalries were often fought out in these Oxford brawls. Yet the university was a republic

Great numbers
of students.
Rise of the
colleges.

of letters for the poor student, who, without disgrace, begged for a livelihood and worked side by side with the man of rank. When the friars went to Oxford early in the thirteenth century, they lived in their own house under strict rules, and the advantages of this mode of life compared with that of separate lodgings were soon apparent, and Oxford followed Paris in establishing colleges. They were at first charitable houses founded by a bishop, or other pious donor, to shelter a limited number of needy students under rather strict rules. But their character slowly changed. Within the college walls lectures were in time given; rich as well as poor went to lodge there, and it was not long before both Oxford and Cambridge were adorned by some of the noble structures that endure still.

Each student was attached to a master, who directed his studies and was also his protector. At lectures the master sat in his chair and the students stood or sat on the straw-strewn floor; from this custom we have the use of the phrase "a professor's chair." At the head of the university was the chancellor, to whom the students were responsible for their conduct. He held his court and had his prison for law-breakers. Sometimes the town authorities disputed his powers, which were, either by royal license or by the privileged jurisdiction which he claimed as an ecclesiastic, independent of theirs, and the violent scenes between "town and gown" often resulted in bloodshed. A student admitted to the university signed the matricula or roll, and was known as a "baccalaureus," a word which means an apprentice to a guild. The goal of study was the master's degree and the license to teach conferred by the chancellor on the recommendation of those already masters. Barren enough were the studies themselves. The "seven liberal arts" consisted of the Trivium (grammar, rhetoric, and dialectic) and of the Quadrivium

Discipline and
studies.

(arithmetic, geometry, astronomy, and music), and all secular knowledge was classified under these heads. Theology was less studied than we should perhaps suppose. It was the most advanced course, and the right to teach it was carefully guarded. Until the fifteenth century Greek was little known, but a good many of the ancient Latin authors were read. Zeal, however, centred in the scholastic philosophy—a system of acute speculation on the tenets of the Christian faith. Scientific knowledge was of course crude. Roger Bacon, the great name in its annals in the thirteenth century, was master of all the learning of the time. While other distinguished Englishmen, like William of Occam and Alexander of Hales, carried their learning to the larger world of Paris, Bacon spent most of his life at Oxford. Theology, mathematics, music, chemistry, medicine, logic, Arabic, Hebrew, and Greek came within the range of his all-devouring curiosity, and his studies brought the penalty of suspicion as a magician, for astrology and alchemy were more congenial to the age than the slow processes of experiment and discovery. Bacon was not free from the superstition of his time, but he was truly great in this, that he taught men to put their trust not in some sudden magic in nature, but in accurate observation of her laws. His great namesake of the sixteenth century, Francis Bacon, was to reassert the principle, which has become the guide to all modern scientific progress.

Though the Norman Conqueror made his own French tongue the language of polite life, English never ceased to be spoken by the people, and the “English Chronicle,” begun long before the Conquest by monkish writers, was continued in that tongue for a century after it. Popular books of devotion, plays and songs that appealed to the masses, and perhaps the more familiar parts of the mystery plays, were also in English. The laws were for a long time

French and
English.

in Latin, but by the time of Henry III we find them in French—sometimes side by side with an English rendering—and French remained the language of debate in Parliament and of the statute-books, though not of the court, until the reign of Richard III. Learned men wrote in Latin that was often corrupt and reckless of the rules of grammar; there is little in English that can rank as literature before the days of Chaucer.

BOOKS FOR REFERENCE (see also Chapter V)

* Jessopp, *The Coming of the Friars, and other Essays* (1890); * Jessopp, *Studies by a Recluse* (1895); Oman, *A History of the Art of War in the Middle Ages* (1898); * Vinogradoff, *Villeinage in England* (1892); Parker, *Introduction to the Study of Gothic Architecture* (1900); Thorold Rogers, *History of Agriculture and Prices in England* (8 vols., 1887–1903); Thorold Rogers, *Six Centuries of Work and Wages*; * Rashdall, *The Universities of Europe in the Middle Ages* (2 vols., 1895); * Barnard (editor), *Companion to English History (Middle Ages)* (1902): articles on Architecture, Monasticism, etc.

CHAPTER IX

England in the Fourteenth Century

(Edward II to Richard II—1307 to 1399—92 years)

Edward II born 1284; succeeded 1307; died 1327.

Edward III " 1312; " 1327; " 1377.

Richard II " 1367; " 1377; dethroned 1399.

[From 1309 to 1377 the popes remained at Avignon in a subservience to France, often called "The Babylonish Captivity," which helped to undermine the Church's influence as a great international power in Europe. This tendency increased when, in 1378, the captivity was followed by a schism, during which there were rival popes, each denouncing the other. Wycliffe in England, and a little later, in the early years of the fifteenth century, Huss and Jerome of Prague on the Continent, attacked the Pope's authority and were forerunners of Luther's revolt. The Turks were now growing troublesome. Having conquered Asia Minor they began, in 1343, to form permanent settlements in Europe, but not until after another century of strife did Constantinople, the Eastern capital, fall before them. The century is marked by unrest in the world of thought, and by disorder and strife in the political field. Though barren of great achievements, it saw the beginning of new forces. Marco Polo revealed to Europe much hitherto unknown about the coasts and the interior of Asia, and stimulated the thirst for discovery, which produced great results in the fifteenth century. Gunpowder was now used and in time revolutionized war. The terrible revolts of the peasants in France and in England show that the common people were beginning to feel their power.]

THE age of Edward I saw the establishment of the English Constitution on its present basis. Though the real meaning of Edward's work was not yet clear, nor its fruit ripe, time was to show that it was in the end the

people who gained the power which the king lost. The surface appearance was far different from the reality.

The real growth
of the power of
the Commons in
the fourteenth
century.

Edward II utterly ignored the Commons, and the path to wealth and greatness seemed to be through the king's favour alone. The glamour of chivalry and luxury served partly to conceal the selfishness and moral degradation of the upper classes, and their violence and treachery in a bitter struggle for power. Most of the conspicuous leaders of the time died violent deaths, and the awful tortures and barbarous mutilations of the executions for treason seem to our age more suited to African savages than to English barons.

Edward II, whose reign saw the beginning of these things, had been taught with care, but he showed such incapacity that men said he could not be the son of the great Edward, but must be a changeling. As a youth he was lawless, cruel, insolent, and without serious purpose. Though he had the tall, strong frame of his father, he lacked his courage. In battle he proved a craven, but he delighted in the vulgar pomp of kingship, in its extravagance and frivolous amusements. He was fond of sports, of horses and dogs, and of the society of low-born people, and much of the folly of his life was due to habitual and excessive drinking. He was skilful at smith's work, at digging a trench, or thatching a roof, but was content to be branded as the "illiterate king," and took his coronation oath in the French provided for the unlearned, and not in the original Latin. The oath was itself the expression of a changed spirit in England, for it laid new stress on the rights of the Commons.

Edward, himself unfitted to rule, soon learned to rely upon men of stronger will and character. His first minister was an intimate companion of his youth, Piers Gaveston, the son of a Gascon knight. Upon Gaveston Ed-

The character
of Edward II.

ward heaped every favour in his power. The Earldom of Cornwall was then, as the dukedom is now, of royal dignity, and he gave it to Gaveston with its vast possessions. Edward I left a treasure to be used for a crusade; his son diverted a large part of it to the coffers of Gaveston, who is said to have conveyed it promptly to his home in Gascony. Gaveston had courtly manners, was brave and formidable in tilt and tournament, and skilful as a military leader. Secure, as he thought, in the king's protection, he showed open contempt for the powerful lords of England. At Edward's coronation he took precedence of England's greatest; his pride, as was then remarked, would have been unendurable even in a king's son, and for some years the political history of England centres in the barons' effort to destroy the hated foreigner. More than once they drove him from the country, and in 1310 they took power out of his hands and appointed twenty-one "Lords Ordainers" to rule the state. In 1312 Gaveston fell into the hands of Thomas, Earl of Lancaster, the Earl of Warwick, and other nobles, and without lawful trial, in base violation of pledges given to him, was taken to Blacklow Hill, near Warwick, and beheaded (June 19, 1312). The execution marks the beginning of a new era of violence. Gaveston's blood was in fact the first of the torrent that involved so many of the nobility in England.

Edward's grief at his loss was deep and real, but he was forced to pardon the offenders. He now called upon the barons to join in a campaign against Scotland. Some held back, some who went proved traitors in the field, and at Bannockburn on June 24, 1314, Edward was totally defeated by the Scots under Bruce. For Scotland the defeat insured independence, for Edward the increasing contempt of his subjects. Lancaster, who had refused to

Edward
commits power
to his favourite
Gaveston.

The barons
destroy
Gaveston.

Edward's
defeat by the
Scots. His new
friends the
Dispensers.

go, obtained control of England. His liberality to the Church and patronage of the poor gave him a popular reputation which his coarse violence, his moral baseness, and military incapacity belie. In time Hugh de Despenser, dubbed by his foes with the opprobrious name of "favourite," stood with Edward against Lancaster, and he and his father of the same name became the main supports of the king. In 1320 Edward granted Despenser vast estates, including a great part of south Wales, but the barons, determined to be controlled by no royal minister, drove the Despensers from the kingdom. They soon returned and civil war followed. Lancaster fell into Edward's hands in 1322 and met with the same cruel fate that he himself had meted out to Gaveston. Many others perished with him.

The Despensers belonged to the old nobility of England; the king's reckless gifts of land and power purchased their support, they came to rely wholly upon his strength, the fatal error of Gaveston, and they practically ruled the kingdom for years. The queen, Isabella, sister of the French king, suffered many humiliations at Edward's hands, and, in the end, led the party opposed to him. She carried her son Edward to the Continent to do fealty to the King of France as Duke of Aquitaine, and when her husband ordered her to return refused at first to come. When she did land in England it was at the head of an armed force and avowedly to destroy the Despensers. Her relations with Mortimer, a great Welsh noble, who had been driven into exile, fortified her zeal against her husband, and it was soon apparent that he had lost the confidence of the nation and had no force that would fight for him. The Despensers fell into Isabella's hands, and were executed as traitors with awful tortures. Edward himself became a captive and his estate was fallen indeed. Parliament, asserting in 1327 not only the

Edward's wife
Isabella
destroys the
Despensers.

old power to make, but the new one to unmake kings, renounced homage to him and chose his son as king.

Deposition and
death of King
Edward II.

But while Edward II lived, Isabella and Mortimer were not secure. They tried to kill him by neglect and by exposing him to disease in a chamber over a charnel-house, but were forced at last to brutal murder. At Berkeley Castle in September, 1327, the unhappy king was killed in his bed.

The reign had been destitute of progress and miserable for both rulers and ruled. In the year after Ban-

The disorders
of Edward's
reign.

nockburn a bad harvest brought want almost to the royal household itself. There was pestilence; dead peasants lay unburied by the wayside, and in the crowded jails the last comers were sometimes killed that they might claim no share of the scanty food supply. Justice was corrupted, the coinage debased. The great nobles sometimes turned out their retainers to pillage, and the Scots ravaged the north with fire and sword. Riots, plots, and misery were everywhere. A foolish king and a rapacious baronage were still strong enough to bring suffering to the people, if not wholly to control them.

Edward III was not yet fifteen when he came to the throne, and for some years his mother and her ally Mortimer ruled. They made what the English

Edward III
becomes king
and soon
destroys
Mortimer.

considered an ignominious peace with Scotland, renounced English claims to lordship over that country, and arranged, but in vain, for a marriage between Edward's sister and David, son of Robert Bruce. Mortimer behaved with foolish arrogance, seized vast estates, lived in great pomp, and at Salisbury broke into a meeting of prelates and threatened loss of life and limb to any one opposing his pleasure. He was the real murderer of Edward II, and it was whispered that he aimed at the throne. But within three years the

young king was strong enough to act alone and he showed great decision. Mortimer was suddenly seized at Nottingham Castle in October, 1330, was condemned without a hearing, and hanged, drawn, and quartered at Tyburn like a common criminal. The queen mother remained in retirement for the rest of her days.

Edward III did not prove to be a good king. His stately presence, grace, and dignity, his love of pomp, his energy and warrior spirit, fit him to be the hero of Froissart's romantic pages. Yet he was not the patriot ruler who fights for his country's happiness and greatness. He had little sense of duty and spent upon selfish pleasure vast sums that Edward I would certainly have used to lighten the people's burdens. He was licentious and cruel and ready lightly to break his word, or even to take a bribe. In war, though he gained victories, he was rash and trusted foolishly to chance. His wife Philippa was a good woman, and after her death in 1369 he sank into deeper moral degradation.



EDWARD III.

It was not long before Edward took up again the war with Scotland. At Bannockburn in 1314 the English horsemen had been routed by Scottish pikemen on foot. At Halidon Hill in 1333 English archers, themselves out of range, poured their arrows into the Scots mounting the hill, and won victory almost without loss. France, anxious to secure Aquitaine, ruled by Edward, helped the Scots and he in turn pressed his claim as heir to the French throne. Under the so-called Salic law no woman could reign in France. Edward's mother was the sister of the late king Charles IV

The character
of Edward III.

Revived war
with Scotland
widens into war
with France,
whose throne
Edward claims.


while the actual king Philip VI, being only a cousin, was less nearly related.¹ Edward admitted that "the kingdom of France was too great for a woman to hold, by reason of the imbecility of her sex," but he claimed that a woman might transmit a right to a male heir, and he assumed the title of King of France. War broke out that was long to desolate France and to bring England barren victories paid for by the blood and misery of the nation.

As yet England had played no part on continental battle-fields, but since the foreign conqueror's victory at

Hastings the spirit of the nation had strengthened, and the Englishman now looked with scorn upon the Frenchman, before whose ancestors his own trembled. On English

village greens incessant practice had developed among the peasants amazing skill and strength with the long-bow, while in France, where the notions of feudal chivalry still reigned, the mounted knight in armour was thought to be unconquerable by those who fought on foot. The French nobility, proud of feudal independence, had learned little discipline; they were fiery and intractable, and it was an unorganized horde rather than an army that their king gathered under his banner.

¹ EDWARD III'S CLAIM TO THE THRONE OF FRANCE



Edward's first great victory was on the sea. In 1340 he attacked and almost destroyed the French fleet in the

English naval victory at Sluys, 1340. Flemish harbour of Sluys. In the days

before artillery such fighting was mainly a hand-to-hand struggle, and usually without quarter; it is said that of the conquered, twenty-five thousand, an incredible number, perished. On land the war was long indecisive, and then came success that revealed to

Europe a new military power. In 1346 Edward ravaged Normandy, imprudently advanced

to the very gates of Paris, and soon was obliged to retreat northward. With difficulty he crossed the Seine and the

The English victory at Crécy in 1346.

Somme, but when his road to Flanders seemed at last secure, he turned at Crécy to face his

foes. The battle that followed was most decisive. The English chose their position on rising ground, and had time to rest before the fight. The French, worn



ARCHERS IN CHAIN-MAIL, ABOUT 1330.



MOUNTED KNIGHTS, ABOUT 1360.

out with long marching, but certain of victory, attacked impetuously as they arrived. Their fifteen thousand Genoese cross-bowmen fired, but were out of range of the English lines. Then came a terrible volley from English long-bows; the

cross-bowmen tried to retire, but the advancing French cavalry rode them down as traitors and cowards, and

charged up towards the English men-at-arms, standing on foot as at Halidon Hill. The English archers on the



CROSS-BOWMEN WEARING ARMOUR,
ABOUT 1330.

two flanks shot down with their deadly arrows men and horses, and while the English lines stood almost untouched the French floundered in hopeless confusion. Probably less than one hundred fell on the side of the victors; of the vanquished about fifteen hundred lords and knights perished, and we shall never know how many thousands more of plebeian blood.

The new English method at Crécy proved a heavy blow to feudal chivalry; men on foot armed with the

The effect of
Crécy.

long-bow were now seen to be more than a match for mounted and mailed knights. Not

two months after Crécy the English overcame and captured David II of Scotland at Neville's Cross, near Durham, and the nation was filled with the

The Scots
defeated at
Neville's Cross,
1346.

lust of conquest. Edward proceeded to make his footing in France permanent. He attacked and at length took Calais, expelled all refusing to recognise him as king, offered

free house accommodation to his subjects settling there, and gave to the town trading privileges that soon made it the centre of English commerce with continental Europe. Over Calais the English flag continued to wave for more than two hundred years.

Edward had re-entered his capital with a conqueror's pomp, when a terrible enemy prostrated all the nations

alike. The Black Death is supposed to have been brought from the Black Sea by Genoese sailors. Its mark was a dark eruption upon the body, and few whom it attacked recovered. All classes and ages, but especially persons in the prime of life, fell before this awful plague, and it is estimated that within the fourteen months of its terrible ravages London shrank to half its numbers. Villages, manors, and monasteries were alike desolated. On one manor the court is summoned for a certain day; before it comes round eleven out of the sixteen persons concerned in the proceedings have perished. Many thousands of the clergy were carried off; terror-stricken people fled to the convents sometimes to find that friar and monk had perished to a man. Crops rotted unharvested in the field. Perhaps half the total population died, and in 1361 and 1369 the pestilence returned, but with effects less woeful.

The Black
Death, 1349.

Renewed war increased the common suffering. The Spanish ventured to dispute English dominion over the narrow seas, and in August, 1350, Edward attacked their fleet between Winchelsea and Sluys. A desperate struggle followed. England's chivalry was there—the king, the Prince of Wales, and the chief nobility—and in the evening Edward landed at Winchelsea, the winner of the first great English victory over the Spaniards upon the seas. His people called him “King of the Seas”—an early claim to their supremacy in sea power.

Renewed war.
Naval victory
over the Span-
iards, 1350.
The battle is
sometimes
called that of
“Les Espa-
gnols Sur Mer.”

The war with France and Scotland continued. At Mauron, in Brittany, the French met with disaster in 1352, and four years later came a defeat almost as crushing as Crécy. Poitiers is the second great English victory on the Continent. Edward, Prince of Wales, known as “The Black Prince,” had marched out from Bordeaux to ravage the

English victory
over the French
at Poitiers,
1356.

south of France and had gathered a huge mass of booty when a French army under King John and his son Philip attacked him near Poitiers. The triumph of the English was complete, and King John and his son remained prisoners in their hands. After Poitiers, the French, inferior in the open field, preferred to shut them-


selves up within walled towns and to leave the enemy to harry the country, but the advantages of this defensive warfare were lessened by the use of artillery, which began in the second quarter of this century.

Cannon were invented before the smaller arms, but our generation, strong for destruction, smiles at their feebleness. Stones were often used as cannon-balls, and only about three shots could be fired in an hour. Yet with the



THE CASTLE DEFENCE BEFORE ARTILLERY.

The bow and cross-bow.



CANNON, FIFTEENTH CENTURY.

appearance of cannon the glory of the mediæval castle declined; hitherto the most formidable assaults were from movable towers pushed up close to the wall or from cumbersome battering-

rams, but now

maddened by the extortion and desolation of war, rose in 1358 in a revolt, called the Jacquerie (from Jacques, the nickname of the French peasant), they were crushed only by the aid of the English leaders, who saw a greater enemy in peasant independence than in France. Both nations were growing weary of what was becoming an inglorious struggle, and France in particular had suffered terribly. The Treaty of Bre-
Treaty of
Bretigny, 1360. tigny in 1360 ended the war for a time.

**Treaty of
Bretigny, 1360.**

France gave up all claim to the Duchy of Aquitaine, the territory lying between the Loire and the Pyrenees; of this Edward III was to be the ruler, and he in turn abandoned his claim to the throne of France and to territory north of the Loire, except the district about Calais. The French King John, a captive in Edward's hands, was to be released for the enormous ransom of about £750,000.



MOVABLE "BREACHING TOWER."


The Treaty of Bre-
tigny was made almost
to be broken. In 1362 Edward created the Black Prince
Duke of Aquitaine. The prince involved him-
self in an unfortunate Spanish alliance; a
campaign in Spain shattered his health and
soon entangled him in debt. His mercenary "companies"
paid themselves by ravaging French territory, and he

Renewed war
disastrous to
the English.

MOVABLE "BREACHING TOWER."

Renewed war
disastrous to
the English.

levied oppressive taxes on his new subjects, who turned to the King of France as their deliverer. King John, moreover, could not pay his ransom and died a captive in England. A crisis came in 1369 when Charles of France summoned the Black Prince as Duke of Aquitaine to appear before him at Paris to answer complaints of his vas-



sals. To this reassertion of the sovereignty renounced in 1360 the prince replied that he would go to Paris, but at the head of sixty thousand men, and Edward once more assumed the title of King of France. But the second war proved disastrous to the English. They lost their cities in Aquitaine one by one, and the Black Prince

at length went home to England with a mortal illness, to linger a few years and to die before his father. His brother, John of Gaunt, led an army to Aquitaine but could do little against the brilliant

French leader du Guesclin, and finally made a truce which left to the French what they had gained.

Fruitless enough were the wars of Edward III and their cruel and bloody character, the oppressions which they involved for the common people, are not to be concealed by the waving plumes and banners of the mediæval pageant or by the florid courtesy of the age of chivalry. Yet their history, it has been truly said, is the real history of the people. Crécy and Poitiers won nothing permanent for the English crown, but they made the English nation certain of itself as it had not been before. Even Edward's misfortunes brought tardy blessings to his country, for the loss of Aquitaine helped to make England independent of continental complications, while the Black Death, by reducing the number of the labourers, helped to increase their wages and to raise their status.

On the whole, Edward's reign shows progress in domestic affairs. Each Parliament held but one session, and as demands for supplies were constant, there were usually two or three elections in the course of a single year. The members of

Edward's
domestic
policy.

the Commons were chosen with little ceremony by the electors who attended the county court, or, in the towns, by the assembled freemen. As yet the working classes had no voice in the nation's councils. Under Edward III the Lords and the Commons finally separated into distinct chambers. The proud Lords preferred to sit apart, but in doing so they unwittingly increased the

Veto power of
the Commons.
English dis-
places French
in the courts.

power of the Commons, for henceforth each chamber must be consulted in regard to proposed laws and the Commons thus secured a veto power. It was a sign of the growth of national spirit that French, used in the plead-

ings in the courts since the days of Henry III, was now, possibly because it was the tongue of a hostile people,

displaced by English, though the proceedings were still recorded in Latin.

The spirit of Edward's commercial legislation was very narrow. Only certain privileged persons, "the merchants of the staple," could sell such commodities as wool, leather, lead, and tin, to foreigners, who in turn could buy only at certain specified places. Trade with Scotland, a hostile country, was wholly prohibited. The export abroad of living sheep was forbidden, lest foreign breeds should thus be improved; and there were heavy penalties for taking iron out of the country. A merchant might deal in but one kind of merchandise. Even diet and dress were regulated. No one might have more than two courses at meals, except on important feast-days when three were allowed. The English must wear only English cloth, and Parliament prescribed a limit to the cost of dress for each class: a servant must not pay more than two marks per yard for cloth; and furs and finer textures, like silk, were forbidden to all but the well-to-do.

The popes, dwelling under French influence at Avignon, now became extremely unpopular in England.

They had long appointed nominees to English benefices in defiance of the wishes of lay patrons or even of the king; for instance, a pope named Adam of Orleton as Bishop of Winchester, in spite of Edward III's opposition, and some said at the demand of Edward's enemy, the King of France. The popes demanded from time to time a direct tax from the English clergy, and a papal collector lived in London in great state to receive moneys for his master, which the nation believed were sometimes used to ransom French captives held by the English. In 1351 Parliament took action, and with "biting words" passed the Statute of Provisors, which forbade the operation in

Restrictions
upon commerce.

Restrictions
upon the
Church's
power.

England of the agents who "provided" English church livings for papal nominees. These "Provisors" had been

Statute of
Provisors, 1351.

Statute of Prac-
munire, 1353.

accustomed to appeal in disputed cases to the Pope, in whose distant court the English defendant could get little redress. To stop the further evil of appeals the Statute of Pracmunire in 1353 forbade the king's subjects, under penalty of the loss of all goods and of imprisonment at the king's pleasure, to be parties, without his leave, to a suit in any foreign court, including that of the Pope. In the next reign these statutes were elaborated and re-enacted, but already in the reign of Edward III they show an aggressive spirit against the Church. Perhaps serious thoughts and reforming zeal were reinforced by the desolation of the Black Death. When in 1365 the Pope asked for the tribute promised to his predecessors by King John, England vehemently rejected the demand. John Wycliffe, a patriot priest, was one of those who spoke most strongly against the abuses in the Church, and Parliament, suspicious of Church influence, petitioned the king not to give high office to ecclesiastics. Since they were the best-educated men of the time and thus the most fit to direct public affairs, it was perhaps well for England that the petition failed, and that priests continued for two centuries still to take a leading part in her political life.

Edward's later years were melancholy. Men ripened young and died early in his age. At fourteen he was a

The scandal and
misrule of
Edward's last
days.

king, and before sixty both his mind and body were decayed. The court was rent by factions, of which his own sons were the centres, and John of Gaunt, allied with Alice Perrers, the king's nurse, became for a time supreme. Parliament struggled against these adverse influences and was encouraged by the dying Prince of Wales. The "Good Parliament" of 1376 impeached Alice Perrers and other corrupt persons about the court, and frankly claimed

that to it the ministers of the king were responsible; but the Black Prince died before much was done and John of Gaunt remained in control. Amid the bitter rivalries of the court even the stately William of Wykeham, prelate, architect, benefactor of future generations by his colleges at Oxford and Winchester, was forced to bend the knee to Alice Perrers in order to secure royal favour. Edward was dying, but she would let him think only of hunting and hawking. Then, as the end approached, she stripped even the rings from his fingers and left him, and only a poor

Edward's death,
1377.

priest remained to whisper some spiritual comfort. The warrior king died little regretted, but since he was the last sovereign before Henry VIII whose title to the throne was undisputed, posterity learned, with slight reason, to look upon the domestic quiet of his reign as almost a golden age.



EDWARD, THE BLACK PRINCE, 1330-1376.

From his tomb.

The heir to the throne was Richard, a boy of eleven, the son of the dead and much-loved Black Prince. Among turbulent uncles the child's claim to the throne would have gained little respect, had it not been for the sanction of divine right already asserted on behalf of the senior line.

The situation in
England on the
accession of
Richard II.

Richard was handsome, clever, and for some time popular. He perished at thirty-three, and much of the folly of his career is due to his youth. In times of crisis he proved bold and tactful; he had strong affections and literary tastes, but was fond of pomp and show and set

the evil fashion, in an extravagant age, of spending great sums on dress. Probably he has fared badly at the hands

The character
of Richard II.

of court historians, who had no praise for a fallen ruler. It is not certain that he was, as they describe him, drunken and profligate. It is certain that, like Charles I, he had theories of the kingly office which no free nation could accept. At a time when Parliament, which half a century before had deposed a king, was making more and more insistent demands to control the Government, he would tell his courtiers that the king possessed full power to legislate for and to rule the state.

The first four years of the reign had passed when a terrible revolt showed the elements of discontent lurking

The outbreak of
the Peasants'
Revolt, 1381.

in England, and confirmed the old woe to the land whose king is a child. As Edward III was dying war with France had broken out again, and the south-



RICHARD II.

eastern shores of England suffered terribly from French pillaging expeditions. John of Gaunt's government was too weak to stop them. He himself was very unpopular and the upper classes, demoralized by war, were selfish and extravagant. There was discontent in the towns, for many artisans chafed under the tyranny of the powerful

The first
struggle
between capital
and labour.

trade guilds, and were especially jealous of Flemings and other foreigners who still controlled an extensive trade in England. Owing to the contrast of their own poverty with the wealth and power of the prelates and the rich monasteries, even the parish clergy were restless. England was

indeed ripe for the first serious conflict between capital and labour.

The most numerous of the discontented classes were the peasants. During thirty years a struggle had been going on between the labourer and his lord. The pestilence of 1349 made labour scarce and wages high. Parliament, which represented, not the labourer, but his master, took action, and the Statutes of Labourers, begun in 1349, provided that every labourer not already engaged must take the work offered to him, at the wages which had prevailed before the plague, and imposed heavy penalties upon those paying higher wages. By a later atrocious provision the labourer who violated these conditions might be branded on the forehead with the letter F (for Falsity). Legislation to regulate prices has nearly always proved futile. England was at the time experiencing a considerable expansion of trade; the pillage of France had brought much money into the country, and the need for the labourers now so reduced in number was active. The villein on the manor was in great demand. He had inherited a servile condition, the law had compelled him to pay his rent in the form of labour for his master, but by the fourteenth century money was in wider use, a good many villeins paid rent in money instead of labour, and worked for whom they pleased. But when labour became dear the lords searched eagerly the manorial rolls and the peasants' pedigrees to find which of their tenants were by birth villeins, and liable to give labour under villein service. But even with the law on his side the master found it hard to enforce his rights, for, since the villein could easily get better pay elsewhere, he often ran away and it was difficult to follow him and bring him back, while those who did remain in unwilling bondage began in time to question the lord's right to keep them enslaved. The craving for equality was already strong and was one of the causes of the outburst in 1381

The discontent
of the peasants.

There were not wanting leaders to declaim against the existing structure of society. John Wycliffe, though near

The teaching of
John Wycliffe.

his end, played still a conspicuous part in politics, and even John of Gaunt, a profligate and worthless man, had found it expedient to ally himself with this stern, almost fanatical, denouncer of the corruptions of the age. In 1378, soon after Richard II came to the throne, Christendom was divided by the appeals of two popes, one at Rome, the other at Avignon, denouncing each his rival's claim to the papal throne, and this schism embittered Wycliffe's growing anger. He attacked the Church's teaching about the mass, which he called a superstitious fable; he declared that her excommunication was only valid if the sinner was already condemned by his own sin, and that her vast possessions were a hindrance to her spiritual work. Wycliffe had a powerful mind and a genius for organization, which he used especially against the monks and friars. His bands of "poor priests" went up and down the land preaching to multitudes, and he had enough political influence to secure their safety from attack. He translated the Bible into English, and wrote and circulated sermons remarkable for vehemence against the evils in the Church. His movement, vigorously conducted, radical and even socialistic in its attacks on property, could not be without profound influence in a time of general discontent. The disciples of Wycliffe



JOHN WYCLIFFE (1324?-1384).

came to be known as the Lollards. It is never easy to trace the influence and the numbers of the adherents of



PEASANTS THRESHING, ABOUT 1340.

new opinions, but Lollard teaching was no obscure factor in the great peasant uprising.

The storm preparing in so many ways finally burst, owing to a new and oppressive tax. An invasion of France was planned in

1380, and to meet the heavy cost a special poll-tax was levied. Each township was to pay a shilling for every

The immediate cause of the revolt.

person within it more than fifteen years of age, and in present-day values this meant a tax of fully twelve shillings per head. The

first results from the tax were disappointing, and early in

1381 collectors went about exacting it more rigorously. There

were angry disputes as to the ages of children said to be liable to the tax, which, to the peasant

who might have to pay for himself, his wife, and several others

in his family, was a burden almost intolerable. Some of the in-

habitants of towns and villages, to avoid payment, abandoned

their homes for a roving life in forests and waste places, and

even more resolute

The armed rising.

action soon came.



PEASANT WOMEN, ABOUT 1340.

First in Essex, on May 30, 1381, then in Kent, then in the far north and in the south-west violent outbreaks occurred. They spread so rapidly that

the uprising must have been skilfully planned. In some places members of well-known county families were the leaders, in others priests like John Ball and he who called himself "Jack Straw" declaimed liberty, equality, and social revolution to ignorant and enraged crowds. There were horrid scenes of violence, those in and near London being the most dreadful. John Ball preached to a vast multitude at Black Heath on the lines,

"When Adam delved and Eve span,
Who was then the gentleman?"

and his address was little but an incitement to destroy the ruling classes. Whenever they could the peasants burned title-deeds and court rolls, which were the chief evidences of villeinage, and judges, lawyers, and jurors, those who, in short, had been instrumental against the poor in interpreting the law, were usually beheaded when seized. The




PEASANTS, FOURTEENTH CENTURY.

mob of London destroyed John of Gaunt's palace of the Savoy, said to be the most splendid in England, and burned the Temple with its legal books and records. Peasants from the surrounding country marched to London and a vast multitude surrounded the Tower where the young king was living. Their demands were insistent:—freedom for the peasants born in bondage; in lieu of personal service a uniform rate of fourpence an acre for the land which they held; the abolition of exacting



JOHN BALL PREACHING TO ARMED CROWDS.



THE DEATH OF WAT TYLER.

While his followers are killing Tyler, Richard is addressing the rebels.

tolls charged in towns like London for the right to trade; and, finally, pardon.

Richard, though only fifteen, showed courage and resource. He consented to go with a few followers to Mile End, and there, face to face with the rebel array, he promised redress. While he was absent from the

The end of the revolt.

Tower a dark tragedy was enacted. Wat

Tyler, the most violent of the rebel leaders, and "Jack Straw" with 400 followers, rushed into the Tower, insulted the king's mother, seized Simon Sudbury, Archbishop of Canterbury and Chancellor, with half a dozen other officials, and promptly struck off their heads on Tower Hill. Bloody revolution seemed thus triumphant in London. It is doubtful if we may believe wholly the received account, which is that, on the next day, Richard, with a small following, met, in Smithfield, Wat Tyler, with a huge disorderly host. The cry of the revolutionists had been "King Richard and the Commons," and the boy's person inspired respect and reverence denied to his ministers. When Tyler, with the arrogance of new-found power, raised his hand in a threatening way to the king, Walworth, Lord Mayor of London, promptly stabbed him in the throat with a short sword, and some one else killed him. The rebel archers drew their bows, and Richard and his small following would, as Froissart's story goes, have perished had he not galloped boldly up to their line and called upon them to take him instead of the traitor Tyler as their leader. The awe of kingship fell upon the host, and on Richard's definite promise of redress they dispersed. The revolt was soon quieted or crushed in other places. Its violence lasted little more than a fortnight.

The Government recovered from its panic, revoked Richard's promises on the plea that in making them he had exceeded the royal power, and then executed the surviving leaders. The revolt appears to have had no effect in

freeing peasants from villein service, but a process, begun before the rising, continued after it. One by one the peasants commuted their personal services, too loosely defined for the freer spirit of the time, for a fixed yearly rent; the lords' power over them slowly decayed, and not long after the revolt the great mass of the English peasants were free men. By 1450 scarcely a manor continued to be wholly cultivated by villein labour, and a century later there were only a few villeins in England; in France the peasants were still serfs attached to the soil when the English labourer had become, almost without exception, free. He tilled the land, or sought work in the town, or took to the sea, and his freedom played a large part in political and industrial development.

After the peasants' outbreak John of Gaunt ceased to play a great part in public affairs, and his brother, Thomas, Duke of Gloucester, and a few leading nobles, ruled the young king and the nation. They kept him in tutelage even after he had attained his majority, and when he chafed under their control they reminded him of the fate of Edward II, and seriously debated among themselves whether they should not depose him. Richard tried to surround himself with his own friends: de Vere, who became Duke of Ireland, de la Pole, whom he made Chancellor and Earl of Suffolk, and others. He appealed at length to Tresilian, the chief justice, and other judges, who solemnly declared that the power exerted by the Duke of Gloucester and his friends was illegal. Gloucester's party took up arms and proved too strong for the king, and under their lead a parliament in 1388, called for its severity "The Merciless Parliament," declared guilty of treason and condemned to death Tresilian and others. An orgy of blood followed that recalled the brutal days of Edward II.

The effects of
the revolt on
peasant
liberties.

Richard's
attempt to
control the
Government.

When twenty-three Richard was at last able to assert himself. In 1389 by a sudden stroke he dismissed his un-
 welcome counsellors and placed his own
 friends in their places. This bold step suc-
 ceeded, and, though faction raged that in the
 end destroyed the unhappy king, he was able for some
 eight years really to rule. Nor did he rule badly. The
 country was soon quiet. Trade, interrupted by the period
 of disorder, revived. He had married, when but fifteen,
 Anne of Bohemia, daughter of the Emperor Charles IV.
 She proved a wise helper, but died in 1394, and her death
 made possible a marriage union, and consequently peace,
 between England and France. In 1396 Richard married
 Isabella, a child of seven, daughter of the King of France,
 and concluded a truce for twenty-eight years with that
 state.

Richard was no friend of the Lollard agitators and ap-
 pears to have persecuted them, but he also checked the
 Church. His statute against "Provisors," passed in 1390,
 took even stronger ground than did the earlier one. He
 also passed a new Statute of Mortmain in 1391, and in
 1393 his Statute of Praemunire increased the penalties for
 appealing to Rome.

To check the Church required courage, for his situa-
 tion was difficult; he was always parrying intrigues by
 Gloucester and his friends, Henry of Derby,
 son of John of Gaunt, Arundel, Warwick, and
 others, to regain control. He proved besides
 his own enemy. He plunged into extravagances, formed
 a plan to become emperor, levied illegal taxes, showed that
 he desired to destroy the power of Parliament, and lost
 in the end the favour of his people. Convinced of a plot
 against him, he suddenly, in 1397, seized Gloucester and
 the earls of Warwick and Arundel. Years before they had
 treated Tresilian and others with brutal severity and now
 their own time had come. Arundel was executed, Glouces-

Richard's
 personal rule
 begins, 1389.

The rashness of
 Richard's later
 rule.

ter soon died, or may have been murdered, and Warwick was sent into perpetual exile. Richard carried matters with a high hand. His sheriffs who had charge of the elections packed a parliament which granted his every demand, and even formally surrendered its powers to him and ordered the arrest of all who criticised the king's actions.

In May, 1399, Richard crossed to Ireland, a country which to his credit he tried to rule well. We have a

Henry, son of
John of Gaunt,
overthrows
Richard, 1399.

pleasant picture of him, now a man of thirty-three, saying farewell at Windsor to the child of ten to whom he was married, lifting her in his arms and kissing her again and again.


His absence opened the door to his foes. He had already banished Henry, Earl of Derby, John of Gaunt's son and



FUNERAL OF RICHARD II.

heir, and on the old duke's death in 1399 he refused to permit the vast estates of the dukedom to pass to their new owner. Henry landed in Yorkshire on July 4, de-

claring that he came only to secure his inheritance, but the kingdom turned to him, and when Richard hurriedly returned from Ireland his cause was already lost. He be-



PONTEFRACT CASTLE, WHERE RICHARD II DIED, AS IT APPEARED IN THE SEVENTEENTH CENTURY.

came Henry's prisoner, and against the fallen king was soon charged a long list of offences—perfidy, misuse of power, attempts at despotism, even murder. He had packed parliaments to do his will and by a packed parliament his fate was sealed. It deposed him and made Henry king. The inevitable tragedy followed. While Richard lived Henry was not safe, and a few months later, in Henry's castle at Pontefract, the young king was found dead, and was believed to have been starved by his jailer.

Richard's
death, 1400.

Richard's reign, with its strife of classes, its religious upheaval, its tragic factions, forms a momentous era in English national life. Higher impulses were now becoming clearer. While Richard was king, Geoffrey Chaucer

made the hitherto rude English speech the language of a new and splendid literature, and his *Canterbury Tales* reveal the modern spirit, keen, humorous, satirical, already at work. The discontent of the time also had its poet. William Langland's *Complaint of Piers the Plowman* is a stern echo of the passions that caused the peasants' revolt. Its author was a poor priest, Chaucer was a courtier, and each wrote in the English that appealed to his class. Wycliffe's Bible and his stirring sermons are in the same tongue and point to the same truth—that the nation had at last learned to speak, and to speak with vigour, its own thoughts in its own way.

The intellectual progress of the age. Chaucer, Langland, etc.



GEOFFREY CHAUCER,
1340 ?–1400.

SUMMARY OF DATES


The **Knights Templars** attacked in France in 1307, were **overthrown** in England in **1308**. The Lords Ordainers seized control of Edward's Government in 1310, Gaveston was executed in 1312, and Edward II's invasion of Scotland and **defeat at Bannockburn** occurred in **1314**. He was enabled to destroy Lancaster in 1322, but his supporters, the Despensers, were overthrown by his wife Isabella and Mortimer in 1326, and in 1327 Edward himself was deposed and murdered. In **1332** we find the Knights of the Shire for the first time deliberating apart from lords and clergy, and thus forming the **House of Commons**. The **Hundred Years' War** with France began in **1338**. **Crécy** was fought in **1346**; in the same year the English overthrew the Scots at **Neville's Cross**, and they took **Calais** in **1347**. Two years later, in **1349**, the terrible **Black Death** broke out. After it there was especially active legislation: the **Statute of Labourers** in **1349**, restricting wages; the **Statute of Provisors** in **1351**, checking papal nominations in England; the **Statute of Treasons** in **1352**, defining treason; and the **Statute of Praemunire** in **1353**, directed against appeals to Rome. **Poitiers** was fought in **1356**, and the **Peace of Bretigny** came in

1360. In **1376** the **Good Parliament** attacked evils in England, but the Black Prince, who encouraged its work, died in the same year. In **1377** Wycliffe was cited to appear in St. Paul's, and an unsuccessful attempt was made by the Church authorities to check his work. In **1381**, under the young Richard, came the **Peasants' Revolt**. The "Merciless Parliament" of 1388 made Richard merely its puppet, but in 1389 he seized control of the Government. His legislation was anticlerical. The new Statute of **Provisors in 1390**, of **Mortmain in 1391**, and of **Praemunire in 1393** made earlier and similar laws more stringent. John of Gaunt's death in 1399 brought the final crisis in Richard's fate.

BOOKS FOR REFERENCE


* Pearson, *English History in the Fourteenth Century* (1876); * Warburton, *Edward III* (1877); * Page, *The End of Villeinage in England* (publications of the American Economic Association, 3d series, vol. i, 1900); Gasquet, *The Great Pestilence* (1893); * Jessopp, *The Black Death in East Anglia* (in "The Coming of the Friars") (1890); * Trevelyan, *The Age of Wycliffe* (1899); Ashley (editor), *Edward III and his Wars* (1887) (extracts from contemporary sources).

GENEALOGY OF THE HOUSES OF LANCASTER AND YORK



NOTE.—It will be seen that the Yorkist line, descended on the *male* side from a younger son of Edward III than was the Lancastrian, was yet on the *female* side descended from an elder son.

The following table shows Henry VII's Lancastrian descent :



CHAPTER X

A Century of Civil and Foreign War

(Henry IV to Henry VII—1399 to 1509—110 years)

Henry IV	born 1367; succeeded 1399; died 1413.
Henry V	" 1387; " 1413; " 1422.
Henry VI	" 1421; " 1422; deposed 1461.
Edward IV	" 1442; " 1461; died 1483.
Edward V	" 1470; " 1483; " 1483.
Richard III	" 1450; " 1483; " 1485.
Henry VII	" 1457; " 1485; " 1509.

[The great schism in the Church was brought to an end by the Council of Constance, 1414-'18, and for another hundred years she was united and able to check heresy. In 1453 the Turks at last captured Constantinople, which they still hold. The fall of Constantinople happened when a new intellectual movement had already begun in the West. After the breaking up of the Roman Empire the civilization of the ancient world had been in part overwhelmed and its treasures lost or forgotten, but society became in time more settled, and intellectual and artistic tastes revived. These found expression first in enthusiasm for the art and literature of the ancient world, and led to a Renaissance or revival of what had been so long neglected. The fall of Constantinople in 1453 aided this revival, for learned Greeks then took refuge in Italy and elsewhere, and were able to instruct an interest already active. But the awakening was not confined to the study of antiquity. Every department of human thought felt the stirring of new life, and the invention of printing in the middle of the century soon made it easy to scatter the new ideas far and wide. While York and Lancaster were fighting and Henry VII was establishing the Tudor despotism in England, new mental and spiritual forces were transforming European thought. It is the age of Lorenzo de Medici, of the moral and religious reformer Savonarola, and of the earlier efforts of Erasmus and the great painters of the next century, Leonardo da Vinci, Michael Angelo, and Titian.

The political world, too, was changing. Italy's devotion to culture and her divisions combined to weaken her as a military power. The French found this out, and, in 1494, King Charles VIII of France led an army into Italy and began there the sway of the foreigner, which lasted until the nineteenth century. Spain soon appears as the rival of France. Castile and Aragon were united by the marriage of their sovereigns, Ferdinand and Isabella, and when the intruding Moor was finally conquered at Grenada, in 1492, Spain had become a great centralized monarchy and was ready for the struggle for supremacy with her neighbour, which in the next age involved all Europe. But no longer was Europe to be the only scene of its rulers' rivalries. The curiosity of the time found its most pregnant expression in the discovery of new regions, of America by Columbus, of a sea route to India by Vasco da Gama; and these discoveries marked the beginning of an era of activity and conflict world-wide in their range.]

WHILE Richard II's foolish rule was still fresh in memory the people were devoted to the man who seemed the bulwark of order. When a group of nobles ventured to plot against Henry IV, armed mobs seized the Earls of Kent and Salisbury and hacked off their heads. The London populace greeted the king in this time of danger with rapturous applause. But his title was valid only as long as its holder was strong. Abroad France and Scotland scorned his claims to be a rightful ruler, at home Wales and the north were but half loyal, and at his own court he was only the first in a group of powerful and turbulent nobles, many of whom were of royal blood, and had hereditary claims as good as his. Henry was always poor, for the Parliament which made him king was niggardly in granting money. The Church pressed him to crush the Lollard heresy as a reward for her support, and he was forced to obey both Parliament and the Church. He could hold the throne only by subservience to his friends, by hard fighting with his enemies. Henry was handsome and attractive, and early travel and wide contact with the

Henry IV's
popularity.

Insecurity of
Henry's
position.

The character
of Henry IV.

world gave him pleasant manners. He was fond of music, had literary tastes, and a keen mind which delighted in argument; for religious orthodoxy he was zealous, too, but when priests plotted against him he hanged them with as little mercy as he did laymen. His later years were haunted by ill-health. Political dangers spoiled his finer qualities of truth and generosity; he, whom Parliament once reproached as too merciful, became suspicious and cruel. Absorbed in preserving his own rule, he effected no reforms, and became an aimless and thriftless king.

Wales aspired still to be an independent nation and found a leader in Owen Glendower, and Henry's weakness seemed to be Wales's opportunity. The

The revolt in
Wales.

Scots, too, attacked him, but in the north he had the powerful aid of the Percies—the Earl of Northumberland and his son, Henry Percy, for his dashing qualities known as Hotspur—who had aided him to overthrow Richard. In 1400 Henry took and burned Edinburgh, and in 1402 the Percies again defeated the Scots at Homildon Hill. They hoped, perhaps, for greater rewards than Henry could give; a quarrel broke

The Scots and
the Percies
attack Henry.

out, and in July, 1403, Henry was suddenly obliged to face the Percies allied with the Welsh and the Scots, while the French attacked his coasts. By rapid vigour he surprised his foes, and at Shrewsbury, on Saturday, July 23, 1403, struck them down. Though Hotspur fell on that field of carnage, the war dragged on. Glendower still held out in Wales, and had with him Edward Mortimer, who claimed to be heir to the English throne. French forces landed at Milford Haven in 1405 and the dismemberment of Henry's dominions was planned. Glendower was to have Wales, Mortimer the south of England, Northumberland twelve counties in the north; it was a wild scheme, but Henry was face to face with the crisis of his life. By this time

he was angry and reckless. Scrope, Archbishop of York, a man of high character, had dealings with the rebels. He had helped to clear Henry's path to the throne, but neither former services nor his clerical character saved him; without proper trial Henry sent him and his ally, Thomas Mowbray, Earl of Nottingham, to the block. He drove Northumberland over the Scottish border, and in time made Glendower insignificant in Wales, though he never captured him.

Henry's hold upon the realm seemed secure, but it was whispered that, as a judgment for the execution of

Archbishop Scrope, he was stricken with leprosy. His old decision and vigour were gone.

Control secured
by the Commons.

A second marriage did not prove happy, and the court was torn by faction, led by his two sons, Henry, Prince of Wales, and Thomas, Duke of Clarence. The king's strength was in his willingness to let Parliament govern, and the Commons won a control over public affairs which they had never before possessed, and which they lost only when civil war began under Henry's grandson. They watched closely every item of public expenditure. The Commons complain of extravagance and dishonesty in the king's household: at their demand he corrects these evils, removes foreigners from the court, even changes his confessor, and offers to meet their further wishes. His pliancy found its reward in their firm support, but he did not live long to enjoy it.

Henry IV's
death, 1413.

His end came in 1413. At prayer in Westminster Abbey he was seized with sudden illness, and soon died, a worn-out old man, though he was but forty-seven.

At Henry's death war with France was imminent, the nation was deeply divided on religious questions, and under a youthful ruler the factions of Richard's time seemed likely again to be active. Henry V proved, however, to be one of the strongest of the kings of England.

Shakespeare has depicted his youth as dissolute, but there is little to support this view. While still in his teens he

The character
and aims of
Henry V.

was leading the attack upon the Welsh and bearing many heavy responsibilities of state, and at twenty-four, when he came to the

throne, he was already a disciplined soldier and statesman. Though a stern king, Henry loved his people and was generous to his foes; he restored the lands and honours of the Percies, and brought the body of Richard II from a lowly tomb at King's

Langley to Westminster Abbey, already the great national mausoleum. No detail was too insignificant for his industry, and his private life was pure. He was a scholar, and had, besides, the gifts of a great soldier and the capacity to win the devoted love of those who followed him. Perhaps Henry, soldier, statesman, devotee, and scholar, was fortunate in



HENRY V.

an early death, before his plans were balked by adverse fortune, or his character was stained in the pursuit of political aims.

Henry IV, urged by Arundel, Archbishop of Canterbury, had favored the passing by the Lords and clergy of the act "De heretico comburendo" (on the burning of heretics), which, for the first time, made it legal in England to send men to the stake for their religious opinions. The law was no dead-letter. In Henry IV's reign English crowds witnessed the burning of Lollard heretics. But signs were not wanting that, at any rate, the middle classes, who were represented by the House of Com-

mons, had no love for the clergy. In 1404 the Commons seriously proposed that Henry IV should take the lands of the Church for a year to meet war expenses, and a few years later the proposal grew into a scheme for the permanent confiscation of the lands of the bishops and of the religious orders. Under Henry V the Lollards began

Henry V and
the Lollards.

to think themselves strong enough to overthrow a hostile government. Sir John Oldcastle, who married the heiress and took the title of Lord Cobham, encouraged the Lollard preachers upon his great estates in Kent and Herefordshire. He was well known and liked by the young king, but his views invited the persecution which was in the air. Two years after Henry came to the throne John Huss, condemned for heresy by a solemn council of the whole Church, was burned at Constance, and the Emperor Sigismund, who was responsible for Huss's death, visited Henry V in England, and fortified his zeal for orthodoxy. Henry pleaded personally, but in vain, with Oldcastle. The Lollards were determined, and revolution was immi-

Destruction of
the Lollard
party, and exe-
cution of Old-
castle, 1417.

nent: there was a plot to seize the king, and rumour said that one hundred thousand men were ready to overthrow the government. Henry acted promptly, and thus probably prevented civil war. He seized many leaders. There were more grim burnings for heresy, the Lollard party was soon no longer formidable, and finally Oldcastle was taken in 1417, and executed with the usual ghastly horrors of a traitor's death. Of Henry himself it may justly be said that he had little taste for this shedding of blood. Lollardy opposed real evils, but it was a revolt against the government, and its plots had become treasonable.

In Henry's time war was thought to be the noblest and most fitting task of kings; from his youth he had borne arms, and his ideals were those of the mediæval

knight. The Turk was pressing in upon Europe, and Henry saw the need of union to meet this danger. He felt, besides, the crusader's shame that the scene of the life of Jesus should remain in the hands of unbelievers. There was as difficult a problem nearer home. The kings of England still claimed the title of King of France, and quartered the French lilies with the English lions upon their coat of arms. France had now an insane king, Charles VI, and was torn by the factions of the Duke of Burgundy and the Duke of Orleans. Apparently Henry had no doubt of his right to its throne, and to save France from anarchy may well have seemed to him a good man's task. Perhaps there were other and more sinister reasons for embarking upon war. If kept busy in France, his own turbulent nobles would be less likely to unite against himself, and before he set out he was forced to recognise the danger from this source. Lord Scrope, a relative of the archbishop executed by Henry IV, joined the Earl of Cambridge, the grandfather of Edward IV, who was to depose Henry's son, in a plot to put the young Earl of March on the throne. Henry heard of it, perhaps through treachery, and with lawless despatch sent the leaders to the scaffold. It was the only share that he had in the political executions which were to bear bitter fruit for his unhappy son.

The coast was now clear for the war with France, which endured for nearly forty years, and ended with the loss of every foot of French territory held by the English kings, except Calais. But as long as Henry V lived the English prospects were brilliant enough. He landed near Harfleur; the age of artillery had already begun, and soon his cannon were vomiting with terrific noise vast quantities of stones against that stronghold. When it fell, he began the long march to Calais, and on the morn-

Henry's design
upon the throne
of France.

Campaign in
France and
victory of
Agincourt,
1415.

ing of October 25 found a great French force crowded together on the little plain of Agincourt to intercept him. It outnumbered the English probably by five to one, but on the evening of that day some ten thousand French dead lay on the field, and the English with much slighter loss had won a great victory.

Agincourt made Henry V the arbiter of Europe, and at home his position was henceforth secure. The English forces slowly overran Normandy, and avenged once more the Norman conquest of England, for now an English king granted the lands of Norman nobles to his English followers.

The treaty of Troyes, May 21, 1420.

By 1420 the English were in a position to dictate terms of peace to France, and in the treaty of Troyes it was agreed that Henry should marry Katharine, daughter of Charles VI; that he should be regent of the kingdom, and ultimately succeed to the throne. England and France were to be perpetually united under one sovereign. The disinherited Dauphin still held out south of the Loire, and against him Henry carried on for two years a vigorous campaign. Probably he undermined his system by overwork; in July, 1422, he was taken ill, and on August 31, 1422, with few of his dreams realized, Henry V died in France. With slow and stately pomp they carried his remains to the sea-shore and thence to Dover and to London. He lies in Westminster Abbey, and over his tomb still hang his saddle, his shield with the lilies of France, and his helmet, borne in that solemn procession nearly five hundred years ago. He had tried to unite to

Henry's death, 1422.



DISMOUNTED FRENCH KNIGHT, ABOUT 1415.

Note the heavy plate armour.

his realm another, many times larger and more populous, but the French and the English were peoples each strong in national spirit, and each resolved not to bear the yoke of the other, and this temper no royal marriage, no written treaty, or military array could permanently change.

A child inherited the throne, and his reign is one long tragedy. There is no sadder tale in all history than that

of the gentle and virtuous Henry VI, surrounded by raging factions which destroyed his friends, his only son, and finally himself.

The child king,
Henry VI.


He was king when eight months old, and appears never to have lived a child's life. At four he rode through London in state, the important person in a great ceremonial; at seven he sat on the throne through fiery debates of the Peers, and was sometimes called upon for the final word; at nine he attended with great decorum and interest the sittings in the trial for witchcraft of Joan of Arc. When he should have been playing childish games his young mind was weighing problems which perplexed Europe.

On the other hand, he was under a system of stern pupilage. There is pathetic humour in the royal license to Dame Alice Butler "to chastise us reasonably from time to time," and a later tutor, the Earl of Warwick, had similar leave to use the rod. Henry seems never to have had the manly, if somewhat brutal, military training of the time, perhaps because he inherited the physical weakness of his grandfather, Henry IV. Constant espionage, and, perhaps, the severity of his teachers, helped to make him timid and afraid of responsibility. But his mind was active. He was a precocious scholar, especially fond of history; sometimes he showed



HENRY VI.

spirit and decision, but favouritism and incompetence marked his rule, and his real virtues were the mild ones of a scholarly saint. His life was innocent and his speech restrained; "Forsooth and forsooth" and "By St. John" were his most emphatic expressions. He watched anx-



CHAPEL OF KING'S COLLEGE, CAMBRIDGE.

Begun by Henry VI, completed by Henry VII.

iously the morals of those about him, and sometimes wore a hair shirt under his royal robes. It is not wholly true that men's evil works live after them and that the good ones perish. The vices of Henry's enemies, Edward IV and Richard III, are now but a memory; the good deeds of the boy king, who, when only eighteen, founded Eton College, still mean much to Britain. Henry, living close by at Windsor, watched Eton, as he did also his other foundation, King's College, Cambridge, with loving care. He chose the Eton masters himself, and delighted in gentle sermonizings to the boys.

The doom of the House of Lancaster ripened slowly. It helped to destroy itself. Henry V left two brothers, who by working together might, perhaps, have made

their line strong. That they failed to do so was not the fault of the elder, John, Duke of Bedford, who was a serious and earnest statesman, of good, but not brilliant, parts. Humphrey, Duke of Gloucester, the younger brother, was a profligate man, shallow, selfish, and without principle, but affable manners won for him from the people the title of the "Good Duke." His patronage of letters has served his memory well, for Oxford cherishes the name of the founder of the library which was ultimately to expand into the Bodleian. Bedford went to France to continue Henry V's work, and Gloucester stayed in England as Protector, to govern in the name of the infant Henry VI. He used his power to balk every project for peace, and to foment the jealousies that ultimately brought on civil war.

For fourteen long years Bedford toiled modestly, unselfishly, and honestly, at the unhappy legacy of conquest. Charles VI,


the insane king of France, quickly followed Henry V to

the tomb, and national feeling now rallied to the support of

his son, Charles VII. By 1428 the English were supreme in the north. They then advanced southward, and besieged the stronghold of Orleans. It seemed doomed, for the French were without real leaders or hope, when the extraordinary influence of Joan of Arc caused a sudden turn in the war. To this day the French patriot looks



JOAN OF ARC (1411?-1431).



upon her as the heroine who first quickened the national spirit of France. The power of this simple peasant girl was mainly in her confidence that the cause of Charles VII was the cause of God, and that the French, to defeat their foes, needed only bravely to face them. She went to Orleans determined to raise the siege, managed to enter the beleaguered city, appeared in armour on one of the towers, and frightened and soon checked the assailants. The English, forced soon to retire from before Orleans, declared her

a witch, whose enchantments defeated their plans; the French, too, believed that unseen forces were on their side. The English cause grew weaker also in the north; Charles VII was soon crowned at Rheims, in the centre of the

English influence, but he was dull and irresolute, and followed no firm plan. Joan fell

Burning of Joan of Arc, 1431.

into English hands, and on May 30, 1431, it seemed as if the disaster at Orleans had been avenged when, after a year's captivity, she was burned at the stake

Death of Bedford, 1435.

at Rouen, as a sorceress and heretic. Yet, though Henry VI was crowned at Paris with great state as King of France, the English never again really prospered. Bedford, worn out, died in 1435.

After Bedford's death, Gloucester was heir presumptive to the throne, but the young king disliked his uncle, and gave his confidence to the Beauforts.

Factions in England.

The old Cardinal Beaufort, the illegitimate son of John of Gaunt, had accumulated great wealth. Shakespeare represents him as a greedy miser, eager on his death-bed to buy back life with his gold, but this does him scant justice; he was a loyal and patriotic subject, whose vast means more than once saved the English cause in the struggle with France. In 1439 Gloucester attacked Beaufort's peace policy furiously, and was met by a stroke characteristic of the time. His foes accused Eleanor Cobham, his duchess, of witchcraft, and proved that she had employed persons, versed in these mysteries, to make a waxen image of the king, which, with magic incantations, was melted slowly, the belief being that the king's body would waste away, as did the image. The Duchess of Gloucester was found guilty, and the citizens of London saw the wife of the heir to the throne walking for three days through their streets with a candle in her hand, bareheaded and barefooted, doing penance for her crime. Her accomplices were executed, and she

was imprisoned for life. In 1445, Henry VI, now a young man of twenty-three, married Margaret of Anjou, a beautiful, able, but unwise woman, and after this marriage Gloucester's power was gone. In 1447, at Bury St. Edmunds, whither he went to attend a Parliament, he was arrested suddenly at his lodgings, and there a few days later he died. Some said that he had been murdered by order of the Earl of Suffolk, a new man powerful with Henry, but his death may well have been natural. A few weeks later died his great rival Beaufort.

The government was now in the hands of Suffolk. To yield national territory and to be defeated in war will imperil a minister in almost any age. Suffolk ceded Maine and Anjou to get Margaret of Anjou as Henry's wife, and under him, moreover, the English met with military reverses. The traders were angry at the prospective loss of territory and trade, and the coast towns at the dangers to their security, if the English should cease to hold both sides of the Channel. By 1450 the French had driven the English out of Normandy, and Suffolk was charged in Parliament with high treason. To save him Henry gave him leave to retire from England for five years, from May 1, 1450, but his foes took bloody measures. He was stopped on the high seas by an English ship, was taken on board and given a day to prepare for death; then they hacked off his head with a rusty sword and threw his body upon the sands of Dover.

Suffolk's cruel and lawless death appears to have caused in England not indignation, but joy—an omen of violent days that were to come. England was, in fact, on the verge of civil war. The king was weak and incapable, and the queen distrusted; there appeared no leader to take Suffolk's place, and the nation was discontented and suspicious.

Marriage of
Henry VI to
Margaret of
Anjou, 1445.

The sway and
murder of
Suffolk.

Civil war
imminent in
England.

A formidable rebellion broke out in Kent, Sussex, and Surrey, under a leader who called himself Mortimer, and claimed to be of royal blood, but who was in reality an

Irish adventurer named Jack Cade. The rebels demanded that the king's council should

Jack Cade's
rebellion, 1450.

be reformed, that elections to the Commons should be free, and that the government's extortions, especially in Kent, should cease. A royal force was partly cut to pieces at Sevenoaks; the rebels entered London, seized and beheaded Lord Say and Sele, the king's treasurer, and took part in other acts of violence. But Cade rapidly degenerated into a mere cutthroat and plunderer;

The rebellion
crushed
mercilessly.

his followers, on the promise of royal pardon, left him, and he was soon killed in Kent. Then followed the merciless reprisals of a bloodthirsty age. Even the gentle king shared the prevailing cruelty. He went about the rebel districts, passing judgment and reaping "a harvest of heads."

The French had now learned to outmatch with cannon the English long-bow, and in 1453 came the final scene,


Final failure of
the English to
crush France.

when, in a strongly intrenched camp at Castillon, they awaited the English attack. Talbot, the chivalrous English leader, charged, but fell in a hopeless struggle, for the French destroyed with their cannon the advancing foe, as the English bowmen at Crécy had destroyed their assailants, without themselves being touched. The struggle was really over. The English flag still waved at Calais; the kings of England still called themselves kings of France, and continued long to do so, and to plan renewed wars to assert their rights, but England never again secured a hold upon France,

The meaning of
the long contest.

and when, a century after Castillon, Calais too was lost, not a foot of French soil remained under English sovereignty. Perhaps some good came from the long contest. The spirit that promoted the war was not wholly a blind lust for territory;

it was as much the restless activity of a race chafing within the limits of its narrow seas. To colonize Normandy with English gentlemen and traders, and to bring



EARLY HAND-GUN.

Note the absence of any lock.

order and prosperity to an almost ruined country, were the designs of Henry V. A wider field for such energy soon appeared: within fifty years of the close of the

French war, South Africa, a new road to India, and a new continent, America, were all open to European energy. In time the restless English found in these fields a needed sphere of action, and many regions of the earth to-day reveal the effects of their instinct for commerce and social order. Since the failure in France they have never essayed permanent conquest in continental Europe: the slaughter of the Hundred Years' War was not wholly a loss if it taught but this one pregnant lesson.

Civil war in England followed close on the heels of the French war. It was whispered that Cade's rebellion

had been planned by one greater than he, and the suspicion pointed to Richard, Duke of York. While Henry VI

was still childless the Duke of York was the heir to the throne. He was an able and experienced statesman, who had been moderately successful as regent in France after Bedford's death. When the news of Suffolk's death reached him he was ruling Ireland,



EARLY FORM OF HAND-GUN.

It is like a miniature cannon.

not without skill, and he hurried to England to check the plans of his rival, Edmund Beaufort, Duke of Somerset, the nephew and the heir of the rich Cardinal Beaufort. A quarrel followed, and poor Henry VI became insane in the face of accumulating disasters. But Margaret soon bore him a son, and then York was no longer heir to the throne. During the king's malady the queen wished to be regent, and York aspired to the same office; he was strong enough to cause the arrest of Somerset, and in March, 1454, Parliament made him Protector. The struggle then took a new turn. Henry recovered his reason and restored Somerset, and York at last made the fatal appeal to arms. In the north he gathered his own followers, and his two friends, the Earl of Salisbury and the Earl of Warwick, afterward the famous king-maker, joined him with theirs. They marched upon London, and in the streets of St. Albans, on May 22, 1455, a battle took place. Somerset was killed, the king was taken prisoner, and the Duke of York was supreme.

First battle of
St. Albans,
1455.

The battle of St. Albans was little more than a bloody street fight: it lasted only half an hour, and probably less than one hundred dead bodies lay in the little town on that spring evening. But the Wars of the Roses—the Yorkists using the white rose as their emblem, the Lancastrians the red—had begun, and for nearly half a century civil strife brooded over England. We speak of the Wars of the Roses, and this suggests long enduring conflicts. Yet twice only, and at intervals separated by ten years, did England see continuous war lasting as long as a year. The fighting was on foot, and though artillery and the long-bow were used, and small firearms now for the first time appear, the struggle was mainly hand to hand. The battles were bloody, almost beyond parallel: tens of thousands perished. Yet by no means was the whole nation engaged

The nature of
the civil war.
The industrial
classes take but
little part in it.

in the contest. The trading classes, in their despair of the feeble Henry's capacity to maintain order, favoured



on the whole the Yorkists, whose stronghold was in the more populous south. The majority of the nobles, higher clergy, and gentry were with the ruling line, and its strength was in the north. As opportunity offered, Lancaster or York would make a sudden effort to gain the kingdom; the nobles on each side, who were bound by solemn pledges to support

their leaders when called upon, would summon hastily their armed retainers or mercenaries, in many cases veterans of the long French war. A march and a fight would follow. There were few sieges: the issue was usually fought out in the open field, and with a decisive battle the levies of each side were quickly disbanded, and war ended for the time. The towns took little part in the struggle: they rarely heeded the call to arms of the rival sides, but kept a supply of both Yorkist and Lancastrian emblems, and opened their gates cheerfully to the victor. During the period wealth increased rapidly. There is evidence that many churches were built, and that, while the barons and their armed retainers were

dying in the field or losing their heads upon the block, the working classes lived in comparative comfort.

At St. Albans, York, though he held Henry prisoner, protested his loyalty, and declared that his aim was only to drive away evil counsellors, and soon, when

The rapid changes in the contest, which becomes steadily more bloody.

madness again darkened poor Henry's mind, he became Protector. Henry recovered, and to get York once more out of the way, sent him back to Ireland. Disorder was everywhere. Marauding French forces haunted the English coasts, and in August, 1457, stormed and pillaged Sandwich. For days their leader lay at anchor in the Downs, defying England; but this menace ended when Warwick, York's friend, took strong measures as guardian of the seas. A ceremony of reconciliation at St. Paul's in March, 1458, seemed to promise peace. Henry walked in solemn procession with his crown on his head, York led the queen, and Lancastrian and Yorkist barons marched hand in hand. It was picturesque, but unmeaning. Both sides were arming; bloody war soon again broke out; York, beaten for the time, fled back to Ireland, and a Parliament held by Henry at Coventry passed sentence of death and of forfeiture of property on the Yorkist leaders. But within six months there was another rapid change when Henry fell into York's hands. An obedient Parliament undid the attainders passed at Coventry, declared York heir to the throne, and

Battle of Wakefield and death of York, 1460.

sacrificed the rights of Henry's little son. But Margaret was strong in the north, and



RICHARD, DUKE OF YORK (1410-1460).

in a great battle at Wakefield the Yorkists received a heavy blow, for York fell. Margaret cut off the head of the man by whose side she had so recently walked in solemn reconciliation, decorated it with a derisive paper crown, and put it upon the gates of York. She marched south with a ruthless foreign horde, and met and defeated in the second battle of St. Albans, York's lieutenant, Warwick. But she could not take London, only thirteen miles distant, and a few days later Warwick was able to enter the capital in company with the tall, handsome son of Richard, Duke of York, a youth not yet nineteen years of age, to be known from that time as Edward IV. Beginning his trade of king-maker, Warwick gathered a small company of peers, knights, and citizens, who declared Edward king, and on March 4, in Westminster Hall, the youth seated himself upon the throne, amid the applause of the multitude. He claimed to be the rightful heir, because descended from an older son of Edward III than was Henry VI. England now had two kings, and loyalty to one was to be treason to the other, with all the dreadful penalties that treason involved.

Second battle of St. Albans, 1461.

Edward IV assumes the title of king, 1461.

Edward IV was a born soldier. He had especially the best gift of the soldier, promptness, and when crowned set out at once, and on Palm Sunday, March 29, 1461, met the Lancastrian army at Towton, a few miles from York. With the exception of the younger branch of the Nevilles, the whole northern baronage were arrayed against Edward, and probably so great a host, before or since, was never drawn up in civil strife in England. Edward and Warwick had much to avenge; three months before, Margaret had slain their fathers, and a few miles off, on spikes over the gates of York, was a ghastly group of her victims'


Edward IV's promptness and great victory at Towton, 1461.

heads. On the Lancastrian side every leader knew that if defeated his life and property were forfeited. Henry, innocent of the fierce passions of the hour, and "better at praying than fighting," spent that Palm Sunday at York in prayers that did not win success for his side. Blinding snow beat in the faces of the Lancastrian host, and they were overwhelmed with great slaughter. Those slain on the field were not the only victims. Henry, his wife and son, escaped, but many who surrendered were sent to the block; the spikes on the gates of York lost their old and received new trophies of human heads. Edward rode over one day from Durham to Newcastle, apparently in a holiday spirit, to see the Earl of Wiltshire's head struck off. He was even more ruthless than Margaret in taking life.

The battle of Towton placed Edward IV firmly on the throne of England. Beside him during all these days there was one who

may well have
 Warwick "the
 king-maker," thought him-
 self the real or-
 ganizer of victory. Richard

Neville, Earl of Warwick, though not yet thirty-three, was in mature life compared with the youthful Edward. He was the richest and the greatest of English barons, and lived in state equal to that of the king; six hundred armed followers rode in his train. His mental qualities were worthy of his great position, for, though defective as a military leader, he was able, far-sighted, and alert.



RICHARD NEVILLE, EARL OF WAR-
 WICK (1428-1471).

He looked upon himself as the creator of the fortunes of the Yorkist house, and was ambitious and greedy of power. Warwick was the English Bismarck of the fifteenth century, with this difference, that as a great baron he had himself wealth and resources to rival those of the king. Royal blood, too, flowed in his veins; he was the cousin of the king whom he served.

Had Edward been only a careless profligate, Warwick would probably have been content with the chief place in the kingdom under him. But the young king had many of the qualities conspicuous in his grandson, Henry VIII—unbending purpose, fierce energy when roused, popular manners, a taste for art and literature, and fondness for field sports; they were alike, too, in their lust and cruelty, though Edward's age was the more unbridled. Henry VIII was content with murder which took the form of law. No law could bind Edward IV; he tortured and destroyed his victims without trial, and, after a battle, executed some to whom he had promised life if they would surrender. No doubt especial rigour was necessary in an age treacherous and morally debased almost beyond imagining, and this is the only palliation for the course of a king, the cruellest and most bloodthirsty of all who have sat on the English throne. Yet he held the affections of the English people. He was the hero of many battles, and never lost one; he had business capacity, which made him rich; and he was true to those who would obey him. Warwick had expected to rule in Edward's name, and would not bend to the king's purposes. Perhaps the two men in their hearts despised each other. Warwick had made bad military blunders, and Edward, the soldier, had an eye to see this, while Warwick, in turn, probably scorned the king's youth and careless indolence.

Grounds of the
quarrel
between Edward
and Warwick.

Edward's
character.

Margaret still flitted for help between Scotland and

France, but with little success. Near Hexham, on May 15, 1464, after a sharp struggle, a further Lancastrian force was cut to pieces, and, at York, on May 26, Edward had the pleasure of watching the execution of fourteen personal attendants of Margaret and Henry. He took little part in the campaign, but his journey to the north in that spring of 1464 was of momentous consequence. One day he went out from the court at Stony Stratford, as if to hunt, rode over to Grafton Regis, and there privately, in the presence of but two or three witnesses, married Elizabeth Woodville, the daughter of Lord Rivers, and the widow of Sir John Grey. Judged by the maxims of statecraft it was the act of a foolish boy. Edward's line needed a marriage alliance with some powerful ruling house, and Warwick was busy with negotiations to effect this when Edward revealed to him the secret of his ride to Lord Rivers's seat on May 1. Of course Warwick was displeased, but Edward was defiant. He heaped honours upon his wife's relatives, married some of them to rich heiresses, and in fact made the Woodvilles, whom Warwick despised as of lowly origin, more than equal in influence to the powerful Nevilles. The great earl, like Wolsey at a later time, had no longer any control over the policy of a wilful master; he was even helpless to prevent the dismissal of his own brother from the chancellorship, and soon was engaged in the dangerous task of intriguing with Louis XI of France against his own king.

Edward IV was stronger than Warwick supposed. Many of the baronial houses now stood by him, and the traders favoured a king whose government promised greater security than did the weak Henry's. That king, a fugitive since the battle of Hexham, fell into Edward's hands and was brought to London; the Lancastrians say that amidst the insults of a London mob he was led through the streets with his

Edward's
marriage to
Elizabeth
Woodville.

Edward IV's
strength.

feet tied under his horse and a straw hat on his head; that in the Tower during the captivity which followed he was half starved, ill-dressed, dirty, and neglected; that his keepers sometimes struck him, and that the gentle king's reproof was only "Forsooth and forsooth, ye do foully thus to strike a king anointed." It was Edward's interest to keep Henry alive, for if Henry died Margaret's son Edward would be the claimant of the throne, with better promise as a ruler than this poor deposed king, at last a physical and mental wreck. The Parliament, now always docile, declared that he, his father, and his grandfather had all been usurpers, and that in Edward IV the legitimate line at length received its own.

Warwick intrigued steadily against Edward. A formidable rising broke out in the north in 1469 under one Robin of Redesdale, who attacked abuses of Edward's government. When the king started northward his brother George, Duke of Clarence, hurried to join Warwick, who was at Calais, and there on July 11, in defiance of Edward's stern prohibition, was married to Warwick's daughter. Next day the earl and his son-in-law landed in Kent. The Kentish men rose at Warwick's call. They marched to London, which yielded at once, and Edward was fairly caught between the rebels on the north and Warwick on the south. Though not present at the defeat of his supporters at Edgecote, soon after he fell into Warwick's hands. Bloody work followed. Some of the Yorkist leaders were executed without trial; the queen's father and brother, hated Woodvilles, lost their heads, and that Edward himself was spared is indeed a mystery; perhaps the sanctity of the kingly office, or some hope that he had now learned Warwick's real power, saved him. At any rate, his authority as king was still recognised; he was soon protesting that Warwick and Clarence were his best friends, and

Temporary
overthrow of
Edward by
Warwick, 1469.

there was talk of marriage between his heiress and the male heir of the Nevilles.

Easy-going as Edward was, he must have waited only an opportunity to crush Warwick, and it soon came. Within six months there was a new rising in Lincolnshire, and Wallis, its leader, when taken, declared that Warwick

and Clarence were its inspirers. They fled from England, and another rapid change followed. Warwick and Margaret now joined forces; it was a strange union, for Margaret

had executed Warwick's gray-haired father, Warwick had denounced Margaret as an adulteress, and her son Edward, Prince of Wales, as no true son of King Henry. But Warwick on his knees begged Margaret's forgiveness, his daughter and her son were betrothed, and for a time the new alliance was resistless. Warwick landed in England.

Edward, lying near Nottingham, was awakened one morning by alarmed servants, who told him that his army was shouting for Warwick and King Henry. It was too true. Edward fled to Lynn, seized there what ships he could, and within a few days was a penniless refugee in Holland. England was in Warwick's grasp. He took poor Henry

from the Tower; Londoners once more hailed that feeble shadow as their king, but Warwick was the real ruler. He called a

Parliament which gave the throne to Clarence, should Henry's direct line fail—a remote chance, as the ambitious Clarence well understood, and he cursed his folly in joining Warwick. Edward IV, indolent in prosperity, was energetic and dangerous in adversity. There were many English refugees on the Continent to join him, and in March, 1471, he landed at Ravenspur, in Yorkshire, where Henry IV had landed seventy-two years earlier. It was Warwick's own country, and as Edward and his two thousand followers marched southward their reception was chilling, but Yorkist barons aided him, and by clever

strategy he got past Warwick, barring the road to London. The capital received him gladly, because, as gossips said, the great merchants wished payment of the debts he owed, and their wives liked his gallant attentions. At Barnet, near London, on Easter Sunday, April 14, the final issue between Edward and Warwick was fought out. The struggle lasted but two hours; Warwick fell, Henry VI was once more a prisoner, and the victorious Edward re-entered London on the same afternoon. For two days the half-naked bodies of Warwick and his brother lay on the stone pavement of St. Paul's. All the world might come and see that the king-maker was dead.

Margaret had not joined her husband in England when he was restored by Warwick, but on the very day of Barnet she landed at Weymouth in the south. When the crushing news of Warwick's defeat and death reached her she would have taken her son, a youth of seventeen, back to France, but reckless advisers persuaded her that Edward could easily be defeated. Margaret's force, worn out with fatiguing marches, took its stand near the old Abbey at Tewkesbury; another bloody fight followed, and Edward won his last great victory. He put Margaret's son, Edward, deliberately to the sword. The headsman claimed other victims, too, but the age was already milder, for neither at Barnet nor at Tewkesbury was there the old dismembering of bodies. Margaret of Anjou was found in a convent near by, and two weeks later, on May 21, a vanquished queen, she rode into London in the triumphal train of her conqueror. On that night Henry

Death of
Henry VI.

VI was murdered in the Tower; he was the last of the Lancastrians, and since his only son was dead his life was no longer necessary to save that cause from a better leader. Margaret went to France to live henceforth in quiet retirement, a pensioner upon the bounty of Louis XI. Edward IV was supreme without a rival.

The England of that day was a small state with little more than half the present population of Scotland, and Edward is said to have known the name, office, and circumstances of every one of any position in the realm. His

The rule of Edward IV. court, like that of the later restoration under Charles II, was loose in its moral tone, and drink and profligacy undermined his constitution and brought him to an early grave. Frequent danger had made him suspicious, and he watched those about him with uneasy vigilance. His two brothers, George, Duke of Clarence, and Richard, Duke of Gloucester, were married to daughters of Warwick, and they quarrelled over his estates. Edward settled the dispute, but Clarence was displeased, and in January, 1478, Edward accused his brother in Parliament of being an incorrigible plotter. With the king as accuser there could be but one verdict, and Clarence was sentenced to death.

Execution of Clarence, 1478. His mother is said to have entreated that there should be no public execution, and it is not out of accord with Clarence's frivolous character that, at his own desire, he should have been drowned in a butt of Malmsey wine. No one raised a voice to save Clarence, but Edward's few remaining years are said to have been clouded with remorse for the death of his worthless brother.

War was Edward's real trade, and when civil strife was ended he turned his thoughts to France. He needed money, and, relying upon his personal popularity, went about asking from his richer subjects pres-

Edward's military plans. He originates "Benevolences." ents, called "Benevolences." A widow gave Edward £20. He kissed her gratefully, whereupon she doubled her gift. Though less

willing, others found it hard to resist the royal request, which was really a command, and benevolences in the hands of Edward and later kings became a ready means of tyranny. By 1475 Edward was able to set out for

France with probably the strongest force that had yet left the shores of England. He assumed the title of King of France, and in alliance with Charles the Bold, who was aiming to set up a great independent state of Burgundy, caused Louis XI some fear, but he allowed himself to be bribed, and became, like Charles II in a later age, a pensioner of France. He wished to marry his daughter to the French Dauphin. Louis appeared to consent, and at the English court the Princess Elizabeth was actually called the Dauphiness. But the French king had other plans, and neither he nor any other great continental state would enter into marriage alliance with Edward's house, whose tenure of the throne they regarded as insecure. Edward turned his arms against Scotland in 1482, with no fruitful results. He was a careless ruler and did little to check the nobles and to maintain the law. His Parliaments were mainly concerned with questions of money and with legislation in regard to trade. At the early age of forty-one, on April 9, 1483, Edward IV died. It was drinking and

Death of Edward IV, 1483.	evil living that ruined him, but the man who could direct in his will that his neediest creditor should be paid first was not wholly bad. He had indeed some fine qualities. If he was cruel, he was not vindictive, and he readily forgave. Those who served him faithfully found him in turn true and free from caprice. But his character must have shocked the moral sense of the nation, accustomed for half a century to an austere court, and the Church can hardly have loved so wayward a son. Perhaps her quiet influence aided Henry VII two years later to overthrow the Yorkist line.
---------------------------------	--

The heir of Edward IV was a child, and again the door was open to the troubles waiting upon a child's rule in an age of violence. The queen mother, Elizabeth Woodville, a weak, perhaps a vicious woman, with many relatives greedy of power, claimed the right to be protector

of the kingdom during her son's minority. Nature had denied her any ability for such a post, and there was

The infant
Edward V and
the intrigues
surrounding
him.

one who united capacity for the task with a right to it, Richard, Duke of Gloucester, the only surviving brother of Edward IV, now thirty-three years old. He had fought with

courage at Barnet and Tewkesbury, was able and resolute, and, in the north where he was best known, even popular. He had tact and personal charm, and his

Richard, Duke
of Gloucester.

refined and pensive features and enlightened reforms show that he had some strong qualities. For nearly a century murder had been

the easy means to get rid of royal rivals, and in it Richard had shared. He was in command at the Tower when Henry VI perished, and it was said that by his hand Henry's heir was killed at Tewkesbury. But the times had outgrown such methods, and soon, when Richard once more used them, the nation turned against him.

The pitiful story of Edward V is quickly told. Within a month of his brother's death, Richard was able to secure

Attacks upon
Edward V's
title to the
throne.

the young king, and with him his governor, the queen's brother, Earl Rivers, and other leaders of her party. The queen herself, with her daughters and her second son, the Duke

of York, took refuge in sanctuary at Westminster, where she was protected by the strong arm of the Church. The doomed Edward was lodged in the Tower, then used as a royal palace, and preparations for his coronation went on. Supported by such great nobles as Buckingham, Hastings, and others who hated the queen's friends, Richard was named Protector by the Privy Council, and he summoned Parliament for the end of June. Meanwhile, Stillington, Bishop of Bath, made a statement that threw strong doubt upon Edward V's legitimacy. He declared that he had himself officiated at a marriage contract between Edward IV and Lady Butler, and that in consequence

Edward's later marriage with Elizabeth Woodville was invalid. It was urged further that this marriage was in any case irregular, for it was without banns or proper ecclesiastical ceremonial, and, in short, that in default of lawful issue to Edward, Richard was heir to the throne. Clarence had left a son, but he was disqualified by the treason for which his father died.

There were some, hitherto friendly to Richard, who drew back when they saw his design, and among these, apparently, was Lord Hastings. One day, at a Council in the Tower, Richard suddenly Richard usurps the throne. bared a withered arm, declared that this deformity had been caused by the magic of his enemies, and accused Hastings of being a party to it: Jane Shore, a former favourite with Edward IV, and a reputed witch, was in fact a refugee under Hastings's roof at the time. The charge was a piece of stage-play, for the arm had probably been deformed from youth, but it cost Hastings his life. Without trial or proof of treachery, he was led to the court-yard and beheaded, and Richard's ruthless determination was revealed. Soon after, the second son of Edward IV fell into his hands, and then the gates of the Tower closed forever upon the two children. Meanwhile, from the pulpit, and in the market-place, the gossip about Edward IV's false marriage was repeated. Soon a petition came to Richard to assume the crown, and on June 25, the day that Edward V's Parliament was to have met, there assembled a self-constituted body, which assumed to speak for the clergy, nobles, and commons of the realm, and asked Richard to become king. After a show of hesitation he accepted. On that same day, in the north, the tragic side of these events was seen; the queen's brother, Anthony, Earl Rivers, the gallant knight, the patron of Caxton, the poet who spent his last hours in writing a ballad that shows no fear of death and no vain carplings at fortune, died upon the scaffold at Ponte-

fract, and Lord Richard Grey, half brother of Edward V, and two lesser persons, perished at the hands of the same



EARL RIVERS PRESENTING HIS BOOK TO EDWARD IV.

The child at the king's left is Edward V. The figure at the earl's right has been thought to be Caxton, the first English printer.

executioner. On June 26, Richard III was publicly proclaimed king, and Edward V ceased to rule even in name. Deposed kings are invariably centres of disaffection. The young prince and his brother were a menace to the usurper, and they died a month or two after his accession, murdered it was believed, though it was never known when or by whom. But in 1674 workmen found the skeletons of two boys at the foot of the staircase in the White Tower, and there is little doubt that the grave had at last given up the secret of the guilty burial two hundred years earlier.

Murder of
Edward V.

Richard had secured the throne, but his usurpation and murders turned the nation against him. For many

months he called no Parliament. The Duke of Buckingham, who had done more than any one else to put him on the throne, entered into a conspiracy with Henry, Earl of Richmond, heir to the Lancastrian claims. There was a rising, but Buckingham failed, and was executed, with some of the other leaders. Richard's only Parliament met in January, 1484. There was some revengeful legislation against the recent rebels; but the Parliament passed also some good acts. It condemned Edward IV's benevolences, proclaimed free trade in printed books, and discarded the old Norman-French, so that the laws of England were enacted for the first time in the English tongue. The Parliament declared Richard's son heir to the throne, and Lords and Commons swore fealty to him. But in April the young prince died suddenly and Richard's grief was terrible. No doubt the want of a direct heir helped to shake his authority. He made terms with the widow of Edward IV, and when his own wife sickened and died, it was believed that he designed to marry his niece Elizabeth, the sister of the murdered princes. His best friends were compelled to tell him that the project was viewed with horror.

Another suitor for the young princess soon appeared prominently on the scene. Henry, Earl of Richmond, representing the Lancastrian line, now became a serious menace to Richard's throne, and he declared that if he won he should marry Elizabeth, Edward IV's daughter, and unite forever Lancaster and York. Henry was the son of the Welsh house of Tudor. He landed on August 7, 1485, at Milford Haven, among his own people, with some two thousand motley and disreputable foreign followers, mainly from Normandy. The struggle with Richard lasted but two weeks. Wales, as well as some of Richard's professed friends, supported Henry, and on August 22 the rivals

Unpopularity of
Richard III.

His reforms.

The Earl of
Richmond's ex-
pedition against
Richard.

met at Bosworth Field, near Leicester. Few were engaged on either side; probably so slight a struggle never before decided issues so great. Richard III, betrayed by his own side, fell on the field; the crown he wore was carried off by a thief, but when it was found hidden in a thorn bush, Sir William Stanley put it upon Richmond's head, and the army proclaimed the new king, Henry VII. On the same afternoon he entered Leicester in triumph, and the body of Richard III, stripped naked, and thrown across the back of a horse, the head and arms dangling on one side, the legs on the other, was part of the rude pageant of that day. He was the last of the Plantagenets. Long before, Richard I had said of his line, "From the devil we all came, and to the devil we all shall go," and the last king in his tragic wickedness seemed to justify the sinister prophecy.

Henry VII gained his throne when only twenty-eight, but he was one of those who are never young.

Henry's
character and
methods.

Since childhood he had been a fugitive in foreign lands, or a captive in his own; in exile he had learned his political conceptions, and

his theory of monarchy was the absolutist one of France, his plan of political action that of the Italian despot, who looked upon war and open violence as gross and rude methods compared with the silent schemes of the closet. Except in a few cases of policy, Henry was just and merciful, and his domestic life was pure. Posterity has called him a mi-



HENRY VII.

ser, yet he kept up a splendid hospitality, and was a magnificent builder: the most sumptuous features of the

Chapel of King's College, Cambridge, and of Westminster Abbey, showed that he spared no cost in carrying out his plans. He loved money, not for itself, but because it was the key to political power. When he borrowed, he repaid, no slight virtue, if we consider the conduct of some of his predecessors, and of his son, in repudiating loans. To his mother he showed tender affection. She was that Lady Margaret who founded St. John's and Christ's Colleges at Cambridge, and divinity professorships in the two universities, and herself translated parts of *The Imitation of Christ* into English. Under her influence the court was grave and austere in tone; there was still talk of crusading to rescue the Holy Land, and religious fasts were kept so strictly, that Catherine of Aragon, a child-wife in England, wrote home that she got no taste of meat during the whole of Lent. Gravity, precision, and method marked Henry's reign. He encouraged art and letters, and was himself, if not a scholar, a man of considerable culture; he could speak well, and was not without a sense of humour. We see him at his worst in the marriage projects of his later years, and Europe was amused at the elderly widower, ready, if adequate dowry were forthcoming, to marry his own daughter-in-law or the insane Joanna of Castile. Though pre-eminently the king of the middle classes, he appears never to have won his people's love. Jovial Edward IV would go off for a day's hunting with the mayor and aldermen of London, and thus gain a popularity impossible to Henry's dignity, piety, pleasant manners, and courtly grace.

Foreign kings thought Henry's authority insecure, and at home the Yorkist party waited only the opportunity to strike; a reckless man would have caused renewed civil war, but Henry was cautious and alert. The heart of the nation was with him; there was no desire to inquire too closely into the victor's claims to the throne, and Parliament simply enacted that the crown should rest in Henry

and his heirs. A little later he fortified his title by marrying Edward IV's daughter, and in doing so he really dis-

The attacks
upon Henry by
Lambert
Simmel and
Perkin
Warbeck.

persed finally the Yorkist faction. But for more than half his reign his enemies kept him uneasy. No imposture was too gross, no falsehood too extravagant, for their belief. Lambert Simmel, son of an Oxford artisan, was

trained by Richard Simon, an unscrupulous priest aspiring to be an archbishop, to play the part of Clarence's son, the Earl of Warwick. When Simmel appeared in Dublin hardly a voice was raised for Henry: it mattered little that the real earl was to be seen alive and in Henry's custody in London. But when Simmel landed in England with some trained mercenaries from Germany and a horde of half-naked Irish, his force was soon cut to pieces, and Henry contemptuously gave him a post in his own kitchen. Perkin Warbeck, a clever native of Tournay, in France, was a more dangerous impostor. He professed to be Richard, Duke of York, the younger of



ELIZABETH OF YORK, QUEEN OF
HENRY VII (1465-1503).

the two princes murdered in the Tower. Him, too, the susceptible Irish received, and the chief courts of Europe favoured his cause; Edward IV's sister, Margaret, Dowager Duchess of Burgundy, welcomed him as her nephew, and King James IV of Scotland gave him in marriage a kinswoman, the Lady Catherine Gordon. For seven years Henry VII was kept in a state of alarm and suspicion. In 1495 he suddenly charged Sir William Stanley, a great landowner, who had put the crown on the victor's head at Bosworth, with treason in Warbeck's interest, and sent him to the block. But the impostor's cause aroused little real

sympathy, and Henry was stronger than he himself imagined. Warbeck at last fell into his hands, confessed, and was greeted in London by jeering crowds. For a time he was kept in easy captivity about the court, but at length he and his fellow captive, the poor Earl of Warwick, whose only crime was that he was the son of Clarence, were sent to the scaffold on a trumped-up charge of conspiracy.

Henry VII's main task was to destroy the old factions, and to give England firm and stable government, and he did it thoroughly. He was patient, secretive, and, when necessary, relentless, in his policy.

The work of
Henry VII.

A passionate desire for peace was abroad.

Parliament passed an act which relieved the minds of those who feared or hoped for a Yorkist restoration, by declaring that no one should be punished in future for obeying the sovereign in possession. With relentless per-

Depression of
the old
baronage.

sistence Henry depressed the old nobility.

Those who fought against him at Bosworth

were by act of Parliament declared guilty of

treason, and their property was in consequence forfeited. All royal grants of land since the year 1455 were revoked. This sweeping confiscation placed the Yorkist baronage at Henry's mercy at a blow, and he obliged them to give heavy security that they would keep the peace. He made a law forbidding the baronage to give their livery to any but their own menial servants, and their hosts of armed retainers were to be henceforth illegal. He weakened them further by giving high office to new men. Land-owners were now allowed to dispose of land so as to leave the purchaser free from feudal burdens, and merchants and traders began to buy great estates. To vindicate the royal authority, and punish powerful offenders, the king set up a new tribunal composed chiefly of members of his own council, and merged ultimately into a court known, from the decoration of the room in which it sat, as the Court of Star Chamber. Henry sent few victims to the

scaffold, but after every plot and rising his commissioners, with the zeal of bloodhounds, hunted out his enemies, and the new court made them pay for their sympathies by fines in proportion to their means: some were still paying in 1506 instalments of fines for offences ten years old. Henry employed special agents to collect taxes, and to see that the laws were obeyed; two lawyers, Dudley and Empson, carried on this work with skill and with oppressive success; they enforced payment of obsolete dues, and were rapacious and merciless. The king collected so-called gifts, or benevolences, with the rigour revealed in the Archbishop's famous aphorism, known as Morton's Fork, that those who lived carefully could pay out of their savings, while those who spent freely had obviously plenty of money.

Long, severe, relentless pressure in the end robbed the king's foes of the power to injure him, and left him with a sure and despotic sovereignty. The nation understood that the king's strength was the guarantee of order, and Parliament consented to be the ready tool of despotism. With its formal rights there was no interference. It still controlled taxation, but Henry, by economy, by fines and forfeitures, by the income from the vast estates of Lancaster and York, grew rich enough "to live off his own," in the phrase of the day. In his long reign of twenty-four years Parliament met but seven times. A modern Parliament looks upon legislation as its chief function, and aims constantly to effect reforms and improvements; we have recognised that change is the condition of progress, and that an incessant readjustment of the laws is necessary to meet new needs. But such conceptions are modern. The earlier age disliked change, and men were glad that Parliament should meet rarely, for when Parliament did not meet there was no new taxation. The last of Henry's Parliaments, indeed, ordained that his decrees should

The royal
power becomes
strong and
despotic.

have the force of law, and for his remaining seven years his power in England was despotic.

Henry surrounded himself chiefly with priests and lawyers, and gave members of the old nobility little voice in the government. Morton, Archbishop of Canterbury, was prominent in his councils, as were also Fox, Bishop of Durham, Sir Reginald Bray, and others springing from the middle classes. But we know almost nothing of their relations to the king, or of the proceedings and debates in Parliament. Morton would preach at its opening, and, amidst the rhetoric of his divinity, would be inserted an announcement of new taxes. Apparently, Henry himself ruled always; kingship was his trade, and he worked at it like any labourer, with ceaseless diligence and anxious care. Of finance, commerce, and industry, he was the special guardian. He prohibited absolutely the taking of interest on loans, and we do not wonder, since the rate charged was sometimes fifty or sixty per cent per annum. He encouraged British shipping by requiring that the wines and woods of Gascony should be imported in English bottoms, an early anticipation of the navigation acts of the seventeenth century that were long regarded as the basis of English prosperity. He built up English manufactures by a treaty known as the *Magnus Intercursus*, creating entire free trade between England and Flanders. With this market opened, the English could henceforth export finished cloth, instead of only the wool, its raw material.

Henry's foreign policy, if not glorious, was safe. To preserve the independence of Brittany he threatened war with France, but was bought off. He allied himself to Spain by the marriage of his heir to Catherine of Aragon. With Scotland, too, he made a momentous marriage alliance. The smaller nation, suspicious of the larger, had long rejected any

Henry's encouragement of the middle and trading classes.

Henry's prudent foreign policy.

union between the two royal houses. But with infinite patience and skill Henry effected his purpose; in 1503 his daughter Margaret married James IV of Scotland, and out of the union came the rule of the Stuarts, the Scottish royal line, in England, and the union of the two kingdoms. When the marriage was planned, Henry was asked if there was not a danger that England might become an appendage of the Scottish crown. "No," said the wise king, "Scotland will become an appendage of the English crown, for the smaller must follow the larger kingdom."

Probably the nation was not sorry when Henry's end came in 1509. By that time England had taken

long strides from the position of a turbulent and

thinly peopled country to that of an orderly state,

with a population rapidly increasing. The age was big with change. The art of printing from movable types—an invention of the middle of the fifteenth century—was already aiding a new outburst of thought and learning, which included art, literature, science, and religion. In Henry VII's carefully kept accounts is entered in 1497 the

sum of ten pounds paid to one John Cabot, a Venetian, who had just reported the finding of a new island far out in the western sea. Five years earlier Christopher Columbus carried back to Spain the news of his remarkable voyage to re-



MARGARET, QUEEN OF SCOTLAND,
DAUGHTER OF HENRY VII (1489-1541).

Discovery of
America, 1492.

gions farther south, and the discovery of America—a long, gradual, and momentous process—had begun.

Vasco da Gama finds sea route to India, 1498. About the same time the Portuguese, after many failures, rounded the Cape of Good Hope, and reached India. A new and vaster world was thus revealed to Europe, and we have hardly yet realized how stupendous were the changes which this was to involve.

SUMMARY OF DATES

The importance of the House of Commons is the striking feature of the reign of Henry IV. For the first time they really controlled the Government. **The bill De Heretico Comburendo** was passed in 1401. **The Battle of Shrewsbury** was in 1403, and the execution of Archbishop Scrope in 1405. After Henry IV's death, in 1413, the Lollards were formidable until the execution of Sir John Oldecastle in 1417. Meanwhile began the long war with France. **Agincourt** was fought in 1415; and **the Treaty of Troyes in 1420** made Henry V the heir to the throne of France. But he died in 1422. **Printing** was invented in Germany by Costar or Gutenberg **between 1438 and 1445**. The English were finally defeated in France at **Castillon in 1453**, the year in which the Turks took Constantinople. **The Wars of the Roses** began with **the first battle of St. Albans in 1455**. The Yorkists were defeated at **Wakelfeld in 1460**. But in 1461, York's son, Edward IV, was declared king at London, and he soon won the **great Battle of Towton**, which made him really sovereign. The struggle for the next ten years was only intermittent. In 1470 Edward had to fight Warwick, and was secure only when he won in 1471 **the two battles of Barnet and Tewkesbury**. Caxton set up a **printing-press in England in 1474 or 1476**. Richard III secured the throne in 1483, and two years later, in 1485, was **overthrown at Bosworth Field** by the Tudor claimant, Henry VII. Henry's systematic rule lacks dramatic interest. **Poynings' Act** (see p. 287), passed by the Irish Parliament in 1494, made the laws of the **English Parliament valid in Ireland too**, and thus brought that country more under English control. From Spain **Columbus went to America in 1492**, and from Portugal Vasco da Gama made his way round the Cape in 1498 to India. **John Cabot's voyage to America** was in 1497.

BOOKS FOR REFERENCE

Wylie, History of England under Henry IV (4 vols., 1894-98); Ramsay, Lancaster and York (2 vols., 1892); Thompson, The Wars of York and Lancaster (1892) (extracts from contemporary sources); Oman, Warwick the Kingmaker (1891); Church, Henry V (1889); * Gairdner, The Houses of Lancaster and York (1886); * Gairdner, Life and Reign of Richard III (1891); * Gairdner, Henry VII (1889); * Stubbs, Two Lectures on Henry VII (in Lectures on Mediæval and Modern History) (1887); Busch, England under the Tudors (1891); Bradley, Owen Glyndwr and the Last Struggle for Welsh Independence (1901); * Fiske, The Discovery of America (2 vols., 1892).

CHAPTER XI

Society in England at the Close of the Mediæval Period

BETWEEN Edward I and Henry VIII, England passed through terrible phases of disorder. Of ten kings, four were murdered and a fifth escaped that fate only by death in battle. Throughout the whole period, except perhaps under Edward III, the power of the king was weak, and the state was practically controlled by the greater nobility. They were few in number; only about forty peers sat in the House of Lords, and more than half of them were bishops or abbots. Great nobles, though they usually had town houses, spent most of the year in the country, where they lived in regal state. The Earl of Warwick and the Duke of Buckingham entertained hundreds of retainers or guests daily at dinner, they had their chancellors, chamberlains, masters of the horse, treasurers, cup-bearers, and staff of household clergy, and were served on bended knee and with etiquette as rigid as that of royalty itself. The Earl of Northumberland had at least twenty castles, and Alnwick, which endures to this day, reveals their magnificence. He issued mandates in the style of royal decrees, and his authority counted for more in his own district than that of the distant king. The Duke of Buckingham's estates yielded him a revenue about equal in modern values to £200,000, and to his court the lesser baronage were glad to send their sons to receive knightly training. Around each castle was usually a great park, where the nobles amused themselves with the royal

pastime of hunting. The fashion of the age involved great extravagance in dress, and with such frivolities and incessant disputes with rivals, the great man's life was apt to be filled.

The old manorial system had well-nigh disappeared. No longer did the noble, by his stewards, carry on the business of a great many manors, and move about from one to the other to consume their produce on the spot. The manors were now leased to tenants, who had become freeholders—that is, as long as they fulfilled the prescribed conditions, they held the land permanently and usually paid rent in cash. Between the great nobles and these new lords of the manor there was a social gulf. From them was required no military service, and, instead of the old feudal levy, the noble now had a host of retainers—men who paid him a small fee and in return received from him food and clothing. He pledged himself to provide them with horses and arms, and they in turn wore his livery and were ready at his beck and call.

By the days of Henry VII the old chivalry which helped to inspire the crusades had lost all vigour, though for more than a century still a few talked of it until Cervantes held them up to ridicule in the pages of Don Quixote. To the fourteenth century the Black Prince

Decline of the manorial system. The armed retainers of the nobles.


Decline of chivalry and of the military effectiveness of the knight in armour.



KNIGHT.
FIFTEENTH CENTURY.

was the beau-ideal of a chivalrous knight; his code of duty and honour showed little regard for the humble in rank, but it was still much higher than the debased code of the warring factions in the next age. Then knighthood fell

very low even in its trade of war. About 1350 the earlier light chain armour gave way to heavy plate armour; breast, shoulders, arms and legs were then shielded with casings



MOUNTED KNIGHT, FIFTEENTH CENTURY.

Note that the horse wears plate armour.

of steel, effective to ward off arrows and heavy blows. But when the knight dismounted and tried to fight on foot, as at Poitiers and Agincourt, he moved with great difficulty. If once he fell he could not rise, and was easily vanquished by plebeian and lightly armed foemen. Not only the

leaders showed decline; so also did the rank and file. The retainers, unlike the vassals of an earlier time, were an idle class who fattened upon war and tumult. When they followed their lord to France they shared the spoils of victory, sold for ransom prisoners who could pay,

and usually killed ruthlessly those who could not. Sometimes the great nobles waged war as if they were sovereigns. For example, the Duke of Norfolk

Private war
waged by the
nobles.

covets Caister, the castle of Sir John Fastolfe, and lays siege to it with an army of three thousand men. When the besieged refuse to surrender, he batters the walls day after day with his artillery. There are truces and negotiations as in regular warfare, and finally the besieged are allowed to march out with the honours of war, and the Duke of Norfolk secures for the

time what he desires. The bloody character of factions reminds us of Italy under its petty despots. The son and grandson of the Duke of Buckingham are, in the dusk of evening, walking through the streets of Coventry. Sir Robert Harcourt and his men attack and kill them both, and in the affray that follows two more perish and others are wounded. The sheriff, representing the king, being powerless, the injured side seeks redress for itself, and what the great men do the lesser imitate with even more brutal violence. Young men of good family, rivalling Robin Hood, already considered a hero of romance, live by robbery, discharged soldiers do the same, and the right of sanctuary in churches is still abused by lawless men as it was in a previous age. Farmers find it necessary to keep fierce dogs to protect their houses. Burnings and riots are frequent. Women, already married or betrothed, are carried off and forced to go through the marriage ceremony with their captors. Children are kidnapped and held for ransom. What we know as "lynching" is common. In the reign of Henry VI, before civil war broke out, while one John Grice is entertaining some friends, armed men surround the house and carry off Grice, his son, and his servant, with the avowed intention of hanging them. They cannot find a rope, so they kill their victims with every conceivable barbarity. The crime appears to have re-

Spirit of
violence in all
classes.



COMPLETE SUIT OF PLATE ARMOUR, FIFTEENTH CENTURY.

mained unnoticed, and two or three years later we find one Serjeant Paston, a lawyer of Norwich, threatened with death and dismemberment like Grice's if he shows too great zeal in a certain lawsuit. Paston does not appeal to the king for protection, but to the great Duke of Norfolk, and at last bargains with his enemies to abandon their vengeance.

Juries were often bribed, or, if disposed to do justice, were intimidated, as was sometimes even the king's sheriff.

The restraints of law made real by Henry VII. Parliament, controlled by the very men responsible for this lawlessness, was more disposed to arbitrate between the offenders than to punish them. But Henry VII gave at last a real check. His Court of Star Chamber hunted out offences with tyrannical vigour and Parliament legislated against retainers and maintenance, the latter being the system by which a great man shielded his dependents from the penalties of their wrong-doing. Bacon has recorded the well-known story of a visit by Henry VII to the Earl of Oxford. When leaving the earl's castle the king passed between two long lines of men in livery drawn up in his honour. The law permitted only household servants to be so arrayed, but when Henry praised the magnificence of the hospitality that required so many menials, Lord Oxford explained that the men were retainers brought together for this special service. The king's comment was a stern rebuke followed by a heavy fine. The slow pressure of these ruinous fines at last worked a cure; and the English people did not forget that it was the royal power which saved them from baronial disorder.

The weakness of Parliament. Parliament appears to have been always ready to obey the power strongest for the moment. Three quarters of the members of the House of Commons sat for towns, some of which were by our standards mere villages and the town members were inferior in social rank to the knights of the shire. But these

were often retainers of great nobles and devoted to their service. After prolonged disputes the members secured payment from those who sent them to Parliament, but a poor man, sent up from a small town which paid him grudgingly his two shillings a day, could offer feeble opposition to powerful nobles, and the duty was so disagreeable that, until pay was given, elected members sometimes ran away to escape the oppressive service. It was a compensation that Parliament remained in session only a few days, and the chief expense was in long journeys to and from Westminster. Though Parliament sat so short a time, it undertook to regulate the smallest details of the life of the people—their sports and pastimes, what they should wear, what they should eat, the price of goods, the rate of wages, and the nature and extent of manufactures. By its varied legislation in the interests of the ruling classes it encroached upon the local powers of the manorial and county courts.

Among the upper classes during this age it is said there was even physical deterioration owing partly to early marriages; since an unmarried ward's property was likely to be wrecked by her guardian she soon took a husband. War and pestilence did not aid godly living, and during the fifteenth century morals sank to a low ebb. As scions often of noble families, bishops and abbots were in some degree allied with baronial disorder. The clergy were very numerous, representing about one in every fifty of the population over fourteen years of age, and the majority of the priests gained their living, not by the active duties of parish clergymen, but as private chaplains, or as chantry priests in saying masses for the dead. Though friars still went about from parish to parish, they were little respected, and the common people were probably anticlerical in feeling. We are told with exaggerated rhetoric that in Henry IV's time every other man was a Wycliffite. This is certainly

Moral decadence
of the age. The
Church's power
declining.

not true of all England. If the monks and friars were unpopular, the parish priests still wielded great influence, and to a foreign visitor the clergy seemed to rule the country. Many beautiful parish churches were built in the fifteenth century and endowed with great riches of vestments, of gold and silver crucifixes, candlesticks, and chalices; to stay away from church was still punished by fine, and observers were struck by the religious demeanour of the people. Yet the decline in the Church's life was real. A secular spirit was abroad. The labourer no longer rested from his toil on the holy-days, few of which except Sunday were observed. Zeal for founding colleges and hospitals was superseding that for building monasteries, and in some of the towns education was taken out of the hands of the priests. Among secular owners the system

Decline of the
monasteries.

of farming by bailiffs had passed away, but the monasteries clung to the old ways and were fast growing poorer. Nor were they growing richer in spiritual treasures. The condition of morals in many was unsatisfactory. Morton, Archbishop of Canterbury, examined the monasteries with great zeal and found much to condemn. We read of gross profligacy, of drunkenness, brawlings, and revellings; of monasteries where the gates were not closed at night, and where frivolous laymen joined the monks in idle feasting; of dancing in the great halls; of the playing of cards and backgammon; of dressing after the latest worldly fashion; of the neglect of schools, etc. These were probably the excesses of the few; in most of the monasteries life probably went its tranquil and monotonous way. But a warning

The
destruction of
the Knights
Templars, 1308.

of what should ultimately happen to them was given early in the fourteenth century, when Edward II, following the rapacious example of Philippe le Bel of France, seized the property of the Knights Templars. These were a lay order leagued together especially to carry on the crusades, and

they were accused of every conceivable crime. Most of the charges were grossly absurd; their real offence was that they no longer did any service to society and yet had great and coveted wealth. A century later the devout Henry V seized the property of the foreign monastic orders who had houses in England, and public opinion was not greatly shocked at this attack on Church revenues. By the time of Henry VII the feeling was already strong that the monasteries had ceased to be useful; soon they were to be completely overthrown.

When Henry VII came to the throne the population of England was probably less than it had been during the Roman occupation. Through vast areas of forest roamed
 The condition of rural England. great herds of deer; the wild boar, the wild goat, and the wild cat, now unknown in England, were still to be found; the beaver, though scarce, was not extinct, and wolves were numerous. In a former age the great landowners had studied agriculture closely, but a prolonged period of strife drew off their attention to other things. Only a small variety of vegetables and grasses was grown. Often cattle were fed on moss, ivy, and the loppings of trees, and owing to the scarcity of fodder, comparatively few were kept through the winter. No attempt was made to improve the breed, and it is probable that an ox or a cow was little more than half the size of similar cattle of to-day; a team of eight and sometimes of twelve oxen was required to draw a plough. There was little inducement to engage in farming, for owing to defective transportation the farmer was obliged to depend upon the local market. The art of agriculture was still undeveloped; ploughing was a mere scratching of the surface; the land was divided into long strips, separated by bits of turf, making proper cross-ploughing and harrowing impossible; it was expressly stipulated, too, that all manure of the farm should be used on the lord's demesne, and a steady impoverishment of

the rest of the land was the result. By Henry VII's reign eight or nine bushels to the acre were regarded as a fair crop, so that the farmer reaped but little more than four times what he sowed. Rents were low; a carpenter could earn in a day the fourpence sufficient to pay for a year the rent of an acre of arable land, and a tangled waste of gorse or furze, because of the fuel which it provided, was of more value than land for farming.


For one commodity there was a steady market. English wool found ready sale, and the English farmer was anxious to use his exhausted land for the pasturing of sheep. With the farms untilled cultivators were no longer required on them; the old manorial system fell hopelessly to pieces; often the dwellings of former villeins were torn down, and manors which had sustained a thriving population were sometimes left without inhabitants. Of course, the labourers lost their work, and riots and disorder accompanied some of the changes, but they were inevitable and in the end wrought good. When used for pasture the land had the rest it needed; owing to low prices, a former freeman on the manor was now sometimes able to rent its whole area, and the village then had a leader who was himself a working farmer, often well-to-do and hospitable. While the great lords were destroying each other, this "frankelyn" farmed his acres and became a man of substance, and the class was more numerous in England during the fifteenth century than in any other European country.

Roads and means of communication deteriorated during the period. The tenants on the manor had been responsible for the roads, but since that system had now lost its vigour, the repair of both bridges and roads was left largely to the good will of devout benefactors. Rochester bridge, notwithstanding the urgency of Archbishop Morton himself,

The demand for wool helps to destroy the manorial system.

Means of communication.

remained in a dangerous state generation after generation. The extensive forest areas preserved moisture in the soil, and, in consequence, rivers were larger then than now. Because of the bad roads much traffic found place upon the rivers, and since bridges were few that they might not interfere with it, travellers, obliged to cross by fords, were often in danger from the frequent floods. Because the roads were too bad for vehicles, goods were



LADY'S CHARIOT, FOURTEENTH CENTURY.


The many horses are due to the cumbrous vehicle and to the bad roads.

carried inland on mule or horseback, and except by the rivers it was impossible to transport bulky provisions any considerable distance. On account of these difficulties of transportation, the price of grain fluctuated wildly in different localities, the variation amounting to as much as 600 per cent. in a single year.

In Edward I's time England was mainly agricultural, but when Henry VII ruled she had become a manufacturing state. Though cloth was her great staple of manufacture, she had in addition iron forges and mines; she made guns, ships, carpets, etc.; and as the Low Countries, far more important a little earlier, had now begun to decline, she was becoming the industrial centre of northern Europe. The scene of this growth of wealth and industry was the town. From the first the town was subject to the authority of the lord upon whose land it grew up—in some cases of the king, in others of a great

Growth of industrial life in England, and importance of the towns.

baron, a bishop, or an abbey. The towns which had the king for their lord thought themselves happy, for he was distant, and interfered little if his financial



PILLAGE OF TOWN, FIFTEENTH CENTURY.

Note the costumes and the architecture.

demands were met; it was different with the noble or the bishop, a near neighbour, who exerted an immediate authority that the townsman often resented. Step by step—by purchase, by bribery, by every means lawful and unlawful—the towns grew in independence. The patriotism of the townsmen scarcely went beyond its walls, and, shut up within this narrow sphere, civic feeling was proportionately intense and passionate. The citizens were united by common interests. They took turns in watching the streets at night; they had common rights of pasturage upon the town meadow; in some cases the whole body was responsible for the debts of each of

its members. There were common gaities, when the passion plays and other amusements were provided by the community as a whole. The townsmen sometimes controlled the Church itself, claiming even the fees paid for masses. Especially in the seaports was the union for defence strong, since the sea was infested with pirates, who could easily land and set fire to the flimsy houses of the town, and sometimes they made unsafe even the crossing of the Thames near London.




ATTACK AND DEFENCE OF A TOWN, FIFTEENTH CENTURY.

Note the weapons—cannon, bow, cross-bow, sword, spear, but as yet no small fire-arms.

Though declining, the guilds were still strong, and were jealously watchful over their own privileges. Al-
 most insuperable difficulties barred the way
 The guilds. to labourers wishing to enter the guilds
 of the trained artisans. Merchants and manufacturers
 formed, like the nobles, a privileged class, and, as riches

increased, their rights were more highly prized and more strongly guarded. The guilds fined both those who



OCEAN SHIP OF THE FIFTEENTH CENTURY.

received and those who paid higher wages than the law allowed, and to relieve the poor was often forbidden, lest it should become an indirect way of adding to a workman's pay. After a time the English merchants drove back the foreigner who had shared with them the home trade. Though in the fourteenth century the carrying trade was in the hands of these strangers, yet by the end of the fifteenth England had a great

merchant marine. We begin now to hear of English merchant adventurers, who are often little better than pirates, but who at least reveal the national courage and enterprise

The perils of
commerce.

in trade matters. Commerce had heavy risks owing to the perils from pirates on the seas.

No royal navy as yet made the English name feared; for safety, companies of ships sailed together, but the danger was always great; marauders of a supposed friendly nation sometimes hanged crew and passengers on the yards of their own vessel, and carried off cargo and ship. There were perils, too, from the king's capricious exactions, and from the fraud and malice of

rival traders. Insurance was hardly known, and to the preacher of the time the merchant with his load of care is the type of the sinner burdened with sin. Yet many a trader grew rich: by the end of the fifteenth century there were merchants in such a town as Bristol who lived in splendid state that seemed to a village poet worthy of the Lord of Heaven himself.

The difficulties of mediæval town government were great, for special privileges were wide and varied. At


Winchester, for instance, the king's and the Church's houses and lands were exempt from

The government
of the town.

civic jurisdiction; thus within the precincts of the king's castle, the cathedral, the bishop's palace, the Convent of St. Swithin, and the Franciscan and Dominican houses, civic officers had no authority. Those living on Church lands paid no dues to the civic authorities;

commerce passing the river in front of the bishop's palace was obliged to pay toll to him. Since no one had full authority, the result was hopeless confusion in the streets of the town. In London the Bishop of Norwich refused to repair the road adjoining his property; there was no power to compel him to do it, and the street in consequence was impassable to traffic. Absurd license marked the use of the streets; festering with the refuse of the butcher and the swine-keeper, they became such hotbeds of disease that


the normal town death-rate was equal to what it is during a pestilence in modern times. An Aylesbury miller



TATTERSHALL CASTLE, FIFTEENTH CENTURY.

The large windows show that serious defence was not intended. Compare Porchester Castle, p. 91.

desiring clay to repair his mill, dug it from the highway, making a hole ten feet wide and eight feet deep;



DECORATED WINDOW, CASTLE ASHBY.

this soon filled with water, and in it a wayfarer passing at night was drowned, together with his horse. A jury acquitted the miller of responsibility, since the road seemed to be the only place where he could get the required clay!

Though civil war raged round the towns, they increased in wealth and seemed to care little for either party; in thousands of documents written at the time the strife is rarely men-

tioned. If the townsman was growing richer, some of the great lords, absent from home on war or in attend-

Indifference of
the towns to
civil war. Their
growth in
wealth.


ance upon the king, were growing poorer as the fifteenth century advanced. Outward deference they still commanded; a great train followed them; the bells of a parish were rung when a noble passed through it, and

when his name was mentioned in an assembly of commoners they doffed their hats in reverence. But the towns, not the nobles, had the power of money; the great Warwick, with vast estates and wealth of plate and fine clothes, is yet found begging a small loan of ready cash. Often the towns could buy out the lord's rights; a trader's daughter sometimes married into the landed class, and, though received with something like disdain

in her husband's circle, she could still contrast the magnificence of her father's house with the signs of poverty about her. In the town itself there were distinctions of rank and caste, the wool merchant looking down upon other traders.

Artillery having at last made the castle of little use in war, the sumptuous tastes of the richer nobles led them to build huge palaces, such as Penshurst and Thornbury, where now there is not much thought of military defence. When Edward I died, the simpler Early English had developed into the more elaborate Decorated style of architecture, and a hundred years later, by Richard II's time, the Perpendicular style had supplanted the Decorated. A beautiful complexity of lines in the tracery of the window openings is no

The architecture
of the period.




HURSTMONCEAUX, SUSSEX; FORTIFIED MANSION, FIFTEENTH CENTURY.

The towers and moat are like features of earlier castles, but the windows reveal the new influences.

longer sought. In huge windows, planned to admit floods of light, lines cross each other wherever possible at right angles, and the heads of the arches are almost square. Few brick buildings had been reared in England since the days of the Romans, but we find them again in the reign

of Henry IV. Though the age saw noble churches, colleges, and baronial houses built, the village dwellings scarcely improved.




PERPENDICULAR WINDOW, ST. MARY'S,
WARWICK, ABOUT 1390.

Note the prevalence of straight lines.

They were of the most flimsy character. In accounts preserved a carpenter is paid five shillings and eightpence for building a new house for the swineherd and shepherd, and the total cost of the house, including material, was but twenty shillings. In such a shed the family often lived at one end, the cow, pig, sheep, and poultry at the other. There was still no floor or chimney; the fire was built on the bare earth, and the smoke got out as best it could.

Canning's house at Bristol, with its tiled floors, rich hangings, and beautiful stained glass, gives us a pleasing picture of a rich trader's surroundings. In some respects the age had begun to understand comfort in the modern sense, and yet even in the houses of the rich we notice still much that is poor and mean. The guests slept many in a bed, and the furniture was so scanty that a few pounds would provide the outfit for a well-to-do household. No trader's house appears to have had a library; it was nobles like Lord Rivers who encouraged literature. In art, too,

Degree of
comfort;
furniture,
painting, etc.



PERPENDICULAR INTERIOR, GLOUCESTER CATHEDRAL, ABOUT 1355.
Note the immense window and the beautiful stone vaulting of the roof, a
feature of the Perpendicular style.

England had taken no independent steps by the end of this period; no native painter or sculptor fit to rank with leaders on the Continent can be named; to serve Henry VII foreign artists were imported, and during the age



MEDIEVAL TAPSTER.

The figure is from the carving in a parish church.

native English mural painting and painted glass had probably declined. In music we find little advance upon the times of Edward I. There was great splendour in dress; both sexes wore rich fabrics often gorgeously embroidered, and feathers now appear as ornaments in men's hats. The fashionable ladies wore close-fitting dresses, and they are accused of tight lacing. Monarch and Parliament deplored the ostentation of the various

classes and tried to check it, but the laws regulating dress were difficult to enforce, and were probably a dead-letter.

In amusements, too, the age shows slight progress. The village still has the same sordid pleasures. We hear too much of the ale-house, to which even the

Amusements.

parish priest and the parish clerk were prone to resort. The number of these places was excessive, and the English were reputed on the Continent to be great drunkards. Each ale-house had its sign, often very elaborate, or its "ale-stake," a post adorned with a bush or garland. At night until nine o'clock a lantern was to hang before the door, which then was to be closed. The law was evaded; at night, and all day long on Sundays and on feast days, toppers sat behind the barred doors over their

ale, and dice, cards, and gambling were as popular then as now in such scenes. The old isolation of the villages was breaking down by the time of Henry VII, for the post-office had then become a recognised institution, and letter-writing was much practised among the land-holding classes. Though the roads were bad there

Travel.

was adequate entertainment for travellers, and English inns were famous for prodigality of food, the fineness of the linen, and the display of silver and burnished pewter. Robbers were, however, common then, as for centuries after, and landlords were accused of complicity with highwaymen in robbing well-to-do travellers.

From many signs it appears that the English were better fed than their neighbours in continental Europe:

Food.

a writer of the fifteenth century notes the condition of the English with abundant food, clothing, bed-covering, and with good farms, in contrast with the French of the same rank, who lacked these things. Meat was very cheap, and the English were heavy meat-eaters. The hours for meals differed greatly from those of the present time. Every one rose with the sun, and in summer the day was already old when dinner came at nine o'clock. The evening meal was taken at about five o'clock, and soon after the family went to bed. Wood was the usual fuel. Artificial light was meagre and dear, and men's occupations were generally completed by the light of day. Soap was so dear that the common people could not get it. There were still no forks

Manners.

or plates in the average household, though royal personages now had both. More refined practices were making way. To carry the knife to the mouth was already thought to show bad manners; and in the reign of Edward IV an esquire is told to be careful not to fill the mouth too full; to cut, not to break, his bread from the loaf; to take broth from a spoon, and not to drink it; and before drinking to wipe the lips with a

napkin; when the cheese is brought, a clean knife and a trencher are to be used, and at the close of the meal the knife is to be carefully cleaned and put away, probably in the belt, and the hands are to be washed.




TABLE SERVICE, LADY OF QUALITY, FIFTEENTH CENTURY.

Note the minstrels in the gallery, the fashion in shoes, and the absence from the table of knives, forks, and plates.

The health of England undoubtedly improved during this age. We have, however, the same insanitary surroundings promoting disease; the country is rarely free from pestilence, and the rate of mortality is tragic. As few people lived to be forty in those days as now live to be seventy, so that the span of life was much shorter. In the houses the floors were often covered with straw, permitted to remain year after year, a receptacle for filth. On the other hand, it is noteworthy that during this age leprosy almost disap-

Health.

peared from England, and after 1464 epidemics no more desolate the whole country, but are confined to the towns. In 1485 a new malady known as "The Sweating Sickness" appeared, and is said to have been brought to England by the rabble army that won for Henry VII the victory of Bosworth Field. Though a singularly fatal sickness, it attacked mainly the well-to-do classes who were given to indulgence in living, and fell far short of the desolating character of the Black Death. Medical knowledge continued to make little advance. The conjunctions of the stars and the age of the moon were thought to have more to do with healing than a careful diagnosis of the disease and chemical analysis of the remedy.

If we estimate justly this phase of English civilization, we shall find it impossible to express in any brief formula the real state of the country. Certainly in the towns conditions had vastly improved. The rate of wages and the prices of the necessities of life show that, when Richard III perished, the craftsmen of the town had a comfortable margin for luxuries. In the village the record is not so pleasing, although there are evidences of prosperity. The law that forbids extravagance in clothing to farmers and labourers reveals that these classes had money to spend. Though Parliament from time to time fixed the rate of wages, this rate shows a steady increase. In the middle of the sixteenth century a bishop, preaching before Edward VI, could deplore the disappearance of the happy conditions under Henry VII, when his father paid three or four pounds a year for his land, had in his employ half a dozen men, kept one hundred sheep, and thirty cows, all milked by his own wife; was able to send his son to school, and to dower his daughters with five pounds each, or nearly twice the annual rent of his farm; could entertain his poorer neighbours, and do something for the beggars and desti-

Features of
progress and
decline in the
age.

tute, always numerous in mediæval society; and do all this from the produce of his land; while fifty years later such a farmer could do nothing for his king, his children, the poor, or himself. It is a glowing picture that good Bishop Latimer thus draws of the days of Henry VII. We know that in that age a serf could rise to a respectable rank among county families, and the land was not so full of misery as we might fancy. No doubt the working man had much less to enjoy than he has now, when social order is secure and war is infrequent; when pestilence and famine have disappeared and work is more regular and its hours shorter; when, too, a trifle will buy luxuries that even the rich did not then dream of. But while in the earlier age the standard was low for all classes, there was not the gulf between the rich man's and the poor man's enjoyments that we now have.

In 1365 it was ordered that the proceedings in the law courts should henceforth be in English, and Parliament was opened with an English speech. Of this

Language and literature.

tongue there were many dialects. It appears, however, that London with, at first, the dialect of the south, learned at last that of the midlands, which in time became the English standard, and was the English that Chaucer wrote. Soon the printing-press was to establish it for all who could read. At Oxford, before Henry VII died, Erasmus, the greatest literary spirit of the age, was learning Greek, and with him there was a brilliant group of leaders, More, Groeyn, Linacre, and Colet, rarely surpassed in any age. The fall of Constantinople in 1453 helped to disperse Greek learning, little known before in the west, and with Greek learning came the revived study of the original language of the New Testament, which caused a new independence in religious thought. The brilliant circle at Oxford wrote in Latin, not in English, yet English had already developed a literature unsurpassed by any continental coun-

try: it had its chronicles, poetry, works in divinity and science; and even already its romances—novels as we may properly call them. The fourteenth century was a great epoch, for it produced Chaucer, Wycliffe, Longland, and Gower, with whom no writers of the fifteenth century can fitly be compared, for though Occleve and Lydgate, who died about 1450, knew Chaucer in their youth, and tried to follow in his footsteps, they lacked the greatness of the master. Sir Thomas Malory wrote about 1470 his *Morte d'Arthur*, which embodies in melodious English prose the romantic legends of Arthur. But the great achievement of the time affecting literature is associated with the name of Caxton. He did not invent the art of printing from movable types—that honour is claimed for two German rivals, Gutenberg and Coster—but he learned printing in Germany, and issued in 1477 the first book printed in England. The labour of Caxton in the precincts of Westminster Abbey, setting his own types and himself translating into English not less than twenty-one of the eighty books that he printed, is of much significance to English civilization. The printed book had a deep meaning. It made men partly independent of the living voice, and in time it placed the best efforts of the human mind within the reach of every one.

BOOKS FOR REFERENCE (See also Chapters V and VIII)

* Denton, *England in the Fifteenth Century* (1888); * Green, *Town Life in the Fifteenth Century* (2 vols., 1894); Capes, *History of the English Church in the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Centuries* (1901).

CHAPTER XII

The Sixteenth Century in England

(Henry VIII to Elizabeth, 1509-1603—94 years)

Henry VIII	born 1491 ;	succeeded 1509 ;	died 1547.
Edward VI	" 1537 ;	" 1547 ;	" 1553.
Mary I	" 1516 ;	" 1553 ;	" 1558.
Elizabeth	" 1533 ;	" 1558 ;	" 1603.

[The century is one of the most remarkable in history : it saw the matured results of the mental activity which had long been preparing the way for change. The monk Luther, by the posting of ninety-five controversial theses on the door of the Castle Church at Wittenberg, in Germany, began in 1517 the revolt against the authority of the Roman Church which we know as Protestantism—a movement that involved Europe in war for nearly one hundred and fifty years, and produced stupendous and permanent results. In the little Swiss state of Geneva, Calvin devoted himself to working out an orderly system of Protestant doctrine, that had far-reaching influence ; while at the same time Ignatius Loyola founded the great Society of Jesus, which led in rallying anew the forces of the Roman Church ; and the Council of Trent (1545-1563) by defining her doctrines, closed the door to compromise with Protestantism. There were other and varied activities. For the first time, with the Portuguese Magellan (Magalhaens) as leader, mariners sailed round the world. Though in America Cortez and Pizarro founded for Spain a great empire, in Europe the decline of her vitality had begun when the Netherlands revolted against the authority of Philip II, and ultimately became a republic. It is the age of such great artists as Raphael, Michael Angelo, and Titian. Copernicus, who died in 1543, taught for the first time a true conception of the solar system ; Erasmus, Ariosto, Rabelais, Camoens, Montaigne, Tasso, Cervantes, and Shakespeare, all world-famous in literature, wrote during this period. European commerce, too, felt the influence of freer movement, and wealth increased to an extent hardly dreamed of by the more isolated communities of earlier times.]

HENRY VII had done his work so well that Henry VIII's position was very strong: with an undisputed title, he inherited wealth and despotic power.

Character of
Henry VIII.

At first he thought little of the cares of government. He was handsome and energetic; few rode so well, or played better tennis; tireless in the hunt, he often exhausted eight or ten horses in a day. Nor were more refined pleasures wanting. He delighted in music, was a patron of art, a great reader, and an author who could write with vigour and skill. Divinity was his favourite study: probably in his realm there was throughout life no firmer believer in most of the doctrines of the Roman Church than the king who overthrew the Pope's authority in England.



HENRY VIII AS A YOUNG MAN.

In June, 1509, Henry married Catherine of Aragon, the widow of his brother Arthur. He soon turned from

Reversal of
Henry VII's
policy.
Foreign war.

his father's policy, and, yielding to popular clamour, and already reckless of the lives of men by whose acts he profited, he allowed Dudley and Empson, the instruments of the late king's extortion, to go to the scaffold. By 1511 he had reversed in continental affairs the cautious policy of Henry VII, and was dreaming of brilliant military exploits, of a new conquest of France, and of becoming the arbiter of Europe. With thirteen thousand men from England and some German auxiliaries; with the Emperor Maximilian, in theory the greatest potentate of Europe, in his train, and under his command, he spent the summer of 1513 campaigning in France. At the "Battle of

the Spurs," on August 16, 1513, the French fled precipitately, and Henry conquered and held Tournay and other places. Two or three weeks later, James IV of Scotland, who, in Henry's absence, had invaded England,

Sept. 9, 1513. was, with a great part of his army, killed at Flodden Field. It seemed as if the glorious exploits of Edward III and Henry V were to be revived; but the English victories wrought little that

Aug. 7, 1514. was permanent, and peace was soon arranged with both France and Scotland.

A young priest named Wolsey had pleased Henry VII by his quick and clever diligence. He was of middle-class origin, his father having been, apparently, a successful grazier and wool merchant of Ipswich. The boy took his bachelor's degree at Oxford when only fifteen, became Fellow of Magdalen College, was introduced at court, and rose rapidly. He



THOMAS WOLSEY,
CARDINAL (1475?-1530).

was not far from forty when Henry VIII came to the throne, and the young king soon found in him a useful minister. For nearly twenty years the affairs of England were in Wolsey's hands. In 1515 he became cardinal, and in 1518 papal legate, a position that made him the representative of the Pope in England, with rank above the old nobility. The Venetian ambassador declared in 1519 that Wolsey trans-

acted business which at Venice required the labours of the whole governing body. He was received on the Con-

tinent by the monarchs of the time almost as their equal, and he lived in state little less than royal. He was Cardinal, Lord Chancellor of England, Archbishop of York, Bishop of Winchester, of Durham, and of Lincoln, and Abbot of St. Albans. Charles V and Francis I each paid him the income of a bishopric. His revenues were enormous, and out of them he was able to build so stately a palace as Hampton Court. Though he, a priest, had an illegitimate son whom he promoted openly, for the time his morals were above the average. He was an upright judge, never accused of bribery or corruption. He reformed the vexatious regulations of the Court of Chancery, he steadfastly befriended the poor, and he avoided bloodshed. Like his father, Henry was still jealous of possible rivals, and beheaded in 1513 the Earl of Suffolk, and in 1521 the Duke of Buckingham, both of royal lineage, but they were his, not Wolsey's victims. Yet few loved Wolsey. The old nobility hated him for his upstart arrogance, and, except possibly in his last year, he was never liked by the people, whom he had taxed mercilessly. His power depended wholly upon the personal favour of the king. The world thought he ruled Henry, but we have it on his own authority that sometimes he would kneel for an hour before the king, but always in vain, to entreat him to change his resolution.

Wolsey's peculiar genius was for foreign affairs. Three young monarchs, Henry VIII, the Emperor Charles V, and Francis I of France, dominated Europe. Between Charles and Francis, who were a little younger than Henry, there was a keen rivalry, especially for supremacy in Italy, now become the prey of the foreigner; and each desired the support of the King of England. A pompous meeting between Henry VIII and Francis I, on "The Field of the Cloth of Gold," took place in 1520, and to show that Henry might still give his support to the emperor, Wolsey arranged that these

Wolsey's
foreign policy.

two sovereigns should also meet. England seemed to hold the balance of power in Europe, and the game went



THE EMPEROR CHARLES V (1500-1558).

on for years. A part of Wolsey's plan was that he himself should become a reforming Pope; and in the end his policy led England to ally herself with France against Charles V. Vast treasure was spent in a fruitless struggle, but it has no interest for a later age. The English traders feared that the alliance with France might ruin their commerce with Flanders, a part of Charles V's dominions, and they had besides to bear

a very heavy burden of taxes. While a modern statesman eases the strain of present need by a loan payable in the future, and meanwhile carrying a low rate of interest, in that age war expenses were paid out of current revenues.

Wolsey met in 1523 the one Parliament called while he was supreme, but when he tried to bully it on the subject of taxation, the members dared to speak out. Though in the end he secured what he really needed, never again did he call upon Parliament to grant money; instead, he levied "benevolences" on the king's authority, and imposed burdens so heavy that traders contracted their operations, masters dismissed

Heavy taxation
involved in
Wolsey's plans.

their workmen, and the people raised a great cry of distress. To them the cardinal seemed the oppressor, not the king, who had the tact to make himself popular.

But war and finance were not Wolsey's most serious difficulties. The revolt against the Church, long ripen-

Wolsey's policy in regard to religion. His defiant attitude towards the Church.

ing, had at last come. In 1517 Martin Luther broke into open defiance of the Pope, and asserted the doctrine of the sinner's justification before God by faith in Christ alone without the medium of priest and sacrament.

In Germany Luther's influence grew rapidly, but in England he produced for the time only a slight effect, and not until Henry VIII's son, Edward VI, came to the throne did a powerful party assert well-defined Protestant doctrine. Yet Wolsey saw changes coming, and helped to effect them. He seized some of the smaller monasteries, and used their revenues to found two great colleges, one at Oxford, the other at Ipswich, on the model, apparently, of William of Wykeham's noble foundations of New College and Winchester, and his bold tone to



MARTIN LUTHER (1483-1546).

the head of the Church showed the working of a spirit not unlike that which prompted the outbreak in Germany: he insisted upon the dignity and independence of the English Church, and told the Pope bluntly that if he did not do what was right, the King of England would follow his own conscience, regardless of papal authority. Henry VIII went merely a step farther when he despoiled all the monasteries instead of only some, and made himself the sole head of the Church in England.

In marrying his sister-in-law, Catherine of Aragon, Henry had violated the law of the Church. The Pope granted a special dispensation, but about 1520 it began to be whispered that after many years of married life the king had doubts whether the marriage was really valid. To make the succession to the throne secure, he passionately desired a son, but though Catherine had borne him sons, all died in infancy; only a daughter, Mary, who became queen, survived, and some pointed to

The question of Henry's marriage with Catherine of Aragon.



CATHERINE OF ARAGON (1485-1536).

the want of a male heir as God's punishment for an unlawful union. Henry's doubts were perhaps partly sincere. But other and lower motives actuated him when he fell in love with Anne Boleyn, a lady of the court, and resolved to marry her. It is not strictly correct to say that he wished to divorce Catherine. His claim was that they had never been lawfully united.

Had Catherine consented, as so many injured women in similar circumstances have consented, the affair might easily have been arranged, but she was as determined as Henry himself. Henry asked the Pope Clement VII to give Wolsey, as legate, power to settle the matter; while Catherine appealed to her nephew, the Emperor Charles V. The Pope, afraid of offending Charles, who in 1527 seized and sacked Rome, and might do worse if provoked, tried to remain friendly with both parties. He gave Wolsey and Campeggio, the Italian Bishop of Salisbury, authority to try the case, but not to render

Henry holds Wolsey responsible for settling the question.

final judgment. Henry looked to Wolsey to arrange the matter, and Wolsey could do little. There was delay, the king grew angry, and in the storm that followed Wolsey was the first to fall. A faction, the leader of which, the Duke of Norfolk, declared that he could tear Wolsey with his teeth, was intriguing against the cardinal, and Henry was at last in a temper to take action. Wolsey's downfall came two years after the question of the marriage was first agitated, and four years before it was finally settled. It was sudden and complete: because he had been party to an appeal of the case to Rome, Wolsey was declared to have incurred the penalties of *Præmunire*, which were forfeiture of property and further judgment at the king's discretion. Dismissed from every office but one—that of the Archbishopric of York—he retired to the north to attend at last to his episcopal duties. Those might have been the happiest days of his life. He was busy relieving the poor, holding confirmations, and acting as peacemaker among his people; the fallen statesman was



RUINS OF FOUNTAINS ABBEY.

rapidly becoming the revered and almost saintly archbishop—but he could not keep his hand out of politics. Letters passed between him and foreign courts. Probably

there was no treasonable design, but the spies that surrounded him stirred Henry's jealous fears, and he sent the Earl of Northumberland to arrest Wolsey for high treason. They brought him southward, but death saved him from Henry's rage. "I am come hither to leave my bones," he said to the Abbot of Leicester, who with his monks received the fallen cardinal by torchlight with great reverence. A few days later he was dead, and it was not many years before the monastery in which he lay, and probably his bones with it, were scattered to the winds.

Wolsey's fall,
1529.

Wolsey was the last great English statesman who belonged to the old order so rapidly yielding to new currents of thought, and in destroying him Henry learned his own power. The cardinal's palaces, the funds set aside for his colleges at Ipswich and Oxford, all his other property, passed by forfeiture to the king, who showed delight in the seizures, and was eager to secure every penny. He destroyed wholly the Ipswich plan; the Oxford college, shorn of some of its greater features, remained, and is to-day Christ Church, the most important foundation in that home of learning. Henry was now supreme and wholly ruthless. In Parliament the members bowed when his name was mentioned, as they did in church at the name of Jesus. The old nobility had been under his feet since the execution of the Duke of Buckingham; the people were without leaders and without organization. Henry was absolutely certain of himself. He preached to his courtiers as if he himself were a faultless saint, and revealed himself to his people as a thoughtful guardian labouring ever for the nation's good. Justice speaks through him; he conceals nothing, he is ashamed of nothing.

In Wolsey's
fall Henry
realizes his
own power.

When Henry had reached this temper he settled the question of the marriage promptly. Not only would he

marry Anne Boleyn, but he was also resolved that there should be no doubts of the legitimacy of any children

Henry puts
away Catherine
and marries
Anne Boleyn.

which she should bear him. By the advice of

Thomas Cranmer he appealed in 1530 to the universities of Europe to state whether the

Pope had power to make legal a marriage with a deceased brother's wife. He paid heavy bribes, and from Italy, France, and England came the opinion of great learned bodies that Henry was right and the Pope was wrong. By ruthless means he forced the clergy of England to support his view: in 1531 the Parliament declared



THOMAS CRANMER,
ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY
(1489-1556).

that since the clergy as a body had sanctioned appeals to Rome, they were, like Wolsey, subject to the penalties of *Præmunire*, which meant the forfeiture of all their goods and possible banishment. They promptly submitted, paid £118,000, the equivalent now of at least £1,180,000, to be let off, and henceforth supported Henry against the Pope. In 1532 Clement VII summarily ordered Henry to put away Anne Boleyn. The king was furious. He now forced

the English clergy to declare officially in convocation that the marriage with Catherine was invalid. Warham, the magnificent and scholarly Archbishop of Canterbury, who belonged to the old order, would not have lent himself to Henry's plans, but at this juncture he died, and Cranmer, the new archbishop, on May 23, 1533, pronounced the marriage null and void from the beginning. Henry had already married Anne Boleyn, and on June 1 she was crowned Queen of England.

The time had come when the long connection between England and the Church of Rome was to be broken.

Compromise was impossible, for Henry was determined to leave the Pope no vestige of authority in England, and to be himself the master of his people's minds and consciences as he was of their bodies. He carefully preserved the forms of the constitution, but made Parliament his docile tool; he chose many of the members himself, drew up the laws they were to pass, and sometimes sat in the

Parliament supports Henry in the breach with Rome.



THE THREE PRIORS OF THE CHARTER HOUSE
DRAWN TO THE SCAFFOLD.

This "drawing" was preliminary to hanging and quartering. The jolting over rough stones and splashing through puddles were both painful and degrading.

House, with his terrible eye on any who might venture to oppose him. Earlier kings had dissolved Parliament after each session. Henry, when he had secured one to his mind, kept it, and to him we owe the custom of holding many sessions of the same Parliament. After inflicting on the English clergy in 1531 fines for *Præmunire*, Parliament proceeded in 1534, at the request of the clergy themselves and perhaps as some compensation to them for this fine, to cut off the old payment to Rome of Annates, the

first year's income from new benefices. In 1533 it forbade all appeals to Rome, and in 1534 entirely set aside the papal power in England. Another "Act for the Establishment of The King's Succession" declared in its pre-

amble that the marriage of Henry and Catherine was null and void from the first; the bill itself made the children of Henry and Anne Boleyn heirs to the throne, and provided further that any one might be obliged to declare upon oath his acceptance of all that it laid down. Never before in England had a serious attempt been made to coerce men's minds. With perfect confidence in his own power Henry took up the task. In 1535

The Act of Supremacy, 1535. the Parliament made him the supreme head of the Church, and a little later it ventured to abolish "diversity of opinions." No position, age, or character was now safe from Henry's zeal

to force every one to agree with him, and the penalty of opposition was death. On a May morning in 1535 three priors from the Charter House in London in their ecclesiastical robes were drawn from the Tower to Tyburn and hanged, beheaded, and quartered, as traitors, for refusing to swear assent to Henry's rule over the Church. Fisher, Bishop of Rochester, was an old man past seventy. He had been the close friend of Henry's father and grandmother, but he could not agree with Henry's opinions, and his head fell upon the block. In Sir Thomas More's garden at Chelsea Henry



THE HANGING OF TWO CHARTER HOUSE
FRIARS AT YORK.

Note that they wear their clerical dress. Before Henry VIII's time it was usual to degrade clerical offenders from their office prior to execution.

had often walked with his host in affectionate converse. When Wolsey fell More became Lord Chancellor, but in



SIR THOMAS MORE (1478-1535).

1533 he resigned, because he saw the quarrel with the Church coming. He did not believe that the original marriage was void, but was quite ready to accept the decree of Parliament, that the children of Anne should succeed to the throne. This was not enough, and More, too, went to the block. One day Henry was burning men for holding Protes-

tant heresies, the next he was executing for high treason those who accepted the Pope's spiritual claims.

In so fierce a contest it was certain that the spoiler's hand should be laid upon the Church's property: while the king was greedy, she was rich. A considerable

The condition
of the
monasteries.

part of the land of England belonged to the monasteries, and shrines like those of Walsingham, and of Thomas à Becket at Canterbury, had vast treasures of gold and precious stones. In the Middle Ages, when law and order were little regarded, the monasteries had been havens of security, and much of what literature that time has preserved we owe to them; they had provided schools, often in remote regions, promoted agriculture, and practised systematic charity. But times had changed; society was more orderly; men no longer believed that the monk's cowl was



JOHN FISHER,
BISHOP OF ROCHESTER
(1459?-1535).

the only safe passport to heaven; they had outgrown the ascetic ideal in which the flesh was regarded as wholly evil. With the zeal of a young devotee, Thomas More tried rigid fasting, slept on the hard floor with a stone for a pillow, and found that it did not promote piety. The monk's severe rule was out of touch with the age. Moreover, some monasteries were scenes of disorder, though not a few were devoted to their work of prayer and almsgiving. But the monasteries were all doomed. Their system of farming was behind the age; their mixture of business with charity was not in harmony with the competitive spirit of commerce, and the half-deserted condition of many showed that society no longer needed them.

Wolsey had begun the work of despoiling the monasteries, and Henry used one of Wolsey's protégés to complete it.

The career of
Thomas
Cromwell.

Thomas Cromwell had
been, in his youth,

something like a freebooter in Italy, and after that had engaged in commerce in Flanders. He entered

Wolsey's service, and was employed in dissolving the lesser monasteries to secure funds for the cardinal's college foundations. When Wolsey fell, Cromwell did not lose the king's favour. He had pleasant manners, sumptuous tastes, great knowledge of the world, and a genius for money-making, which led him to promise that Henry should be the richest prince in Christendom. Apparently he had learned in Italy both the political creed of Machiavelli and dislike for the papacy. He was believed to know by heart the New Testament in Greek, and in 1536 he ordered the English Bible to be set up in the churches. There can be no doubt that he was favourable to Luther's teaching, and when his hour came it was



THOMAS CROMWELL, EARL OF
ESSEX (1485?-1540).



The immense number of the monasteries suggests the extent of the social upheaval caused by their dissolution.

debated whether he should be burned for heresy or executed for treason.

Henry made Cromwell Vicar-General, with rank above archbishops, bishops, and all lay persons, and a ruthless work of desolation began. In 1535 Cromwell's agents were busy examining the monasteries, and some of their reports assert grave scandals; but the gossip of spies and of monks, either intimidated or bribed to tattle against their fellows, is of little worth as evidence, and though, without doubt, many of the charges were true, the innocent were condemned freely with the guilty. It was on such testimony that Cromwell put through Parliament in 1536 an act confiscating the smaller monasteries. At the same time, by promising pensions to dispossessed monks, he urged the larger houses to surrender their property voluntarily to the king. Many did so, but some remained obdurate, and in 1539 a further act of Parliament confiscated all the remaining monasteries. The bloodshed and ruin which the work involved are to us scarcely conceivable. Cromwell stopped at nothing. Troublesome abbots he condemned before trial to be hanged. His agents destroyed many noble abbey buildings, with their beautiful churches: of the shrine of Becket at Canterbury not a fragment was left, and the gold and jewels went of course to the royal coffers. The spoilers ransacked tombs, scattered valuable libraries to the winds, and rendered homeless hundreds of monks and nuns, some of whom, however, were pensioned. Majestic ruins, beautiful in their decay, are evidence still of the desolation and destruction which swept from one end of England to the other.


Besides great accumulations of plate and jewels, the monasteries had annual revenues of perhaps £150,000, equal to ten times that sum now. Henry's plea for confiscation was that this money could be used more effectively for benevolent purposes. Some of it he did devote

to religious work; he founded six new bishoprics and re-organized a few old monastic foundations as cathedral establishments, but to him personally and to his favourites went the chief riches of the monasteries. Henry's share of the spoil was equal, perhaps, to £15,000,000 in modern values. Cromwell himself took the entire property of the Abbey of Lewes, and much besides. The Duke of Suffolk got thirty religious foundations, the family of Dudley eighteen, Lord Clinton twelve, Lord Audley nine. New men, such as Russell, Cavendish, Herbert, Rich, Seymour, Paget, were able to found families, still conspicuous, whose property was based on the spoliation of the Church. Henry even made some of the old landowners take abbey property in exchange for their own that they should from self-interest resist future attempts at restoration: it is said that forty thousand families were soon holding abbey lands.

The social order was greatly disturbed by all this ruin. The monasteries had helped the poor; above all, they had educated the young. In some few cases, indeed, the hand of the spoiler was stayed by the evidences of good work, but on the whole the good were ruined with the bad. With the monasteries, hospitals that sheltered the weak, the aged and the destitute, were destroyed, and sick and blind were turned out of doors. Nor did Henry fail to look round for more booty, though the desolation of the parish churches was left to his successor. But it seemed in the autumn of 1536 as if Henry had carried the ruin too far. Outbreaks began in Lincolnshire; then the clergy, gentry, and common people of the north joined in a formidable demand that the monasteries should be restored, base-born counsellors, like Cromwell, dismissed, and heretic bishops, such as Cranmer, deprived and punished. The Archbishop of York and hundreds of the clergy joined the rebels, who planned a march to London

The plunder of
the monasteries.

Disturbances
springing from
the dissolution of
the monasteries.
The Pilgrimage
of Grace, 1536.



ST. EDMUND'S ABBEY BEFORE THE SUPPRESSION.
The buildings were almost completely destroyed after the suppression.

on a Pilgrimage of Grace, to seek redress from the king. The Pope was known to be on the point of excommunicating and pronouncing deposition against Henry, and was trying to stir up the Continent to attack him. He was really frightened. He met Robert Aske, the rebel leader, with fair words; he promised to forgive the rebels, and to gratify the north, jealous of the supremacy of the south, by holding a Parliament at York. But when the hostile forces melted away before his promises, his tone



THE BURNING PLACE AT SMITHFIELD.

The scene is that of the execution of Ann Askew and others. Note the preacher exhorting the unfortunates who are being burned.

changed, and he ordered terrible vengeance in the regions most affected. Not only were Aske and other leaders executed; hundreds of peasants were hanged on trees or gibbets as a warning to others, and after crushing this rising Henry was strong enough to carry out his policy without fear of serious opposition.

What Henry appears to have desired was to preserve in England the doctrines and ritual of the mediæval Church deprived of any connection with Rome. Perhaps

in this lay the secret of his strength, for he did not disturb the religious habits of the people; they still had the mass and the other rites to which they were accustomed, and so long as these were left, many, even of the devout, probably objected little to the revolt against the distant Pope. To Protestant feeling Henry yielded so far as to have the Bible, in Tyndale's translation improved by Coverdale, placed in the churches where the people might read it. But he insisted upon the old doctrines. An act of 1539 affirmed in Six Articles leading tenets of the Roman Church—transubstantiation, that priests might not marry, the necessity of confession to a priest, and of private masses—with terrible penalties for rejecting them. During the rest of his life Henry worked in the spirit of the act, and claimed many victims. Even a friend of his own queen, Ann Askew, was burned in 1545 for holding Protestant heresy. In the social and religious upheaval of the reign it is estimated that not less than seventy thousand persons, rebels, Protestants, and Romanists perished at the king's order.

Henry was an intensely selfish man, to whom caprices were law. He soon wearied of Anne Boleyn. She bore him a daughter, Elizabeth, who became queen, but not the son for whom Henry hoped. He was troubled, because as yet there was no male heir to succeed him; moreover, court gossips were busy, and Anne herself was a frivolous and imprudent woman. Suddenly, in 1536, she was accused of misconduct too outrageous and improbable to be wholly true. She was tried, her own uncle presiding at the court, and was found guilty; her marriage with the king was declared invalid, and she was promptly sent to the block. On the day after Catherine of Aragon's death Henry had held a joyous festival; on that of Anne Boleyn's execution he went merrily to the hunt, and on

Henry plans to retain Roman doctrine without Roman supremacy.

Henry's successive marriages.

May 19, 1536.

the next day he married Jane Seymour. In the following year, October 24, 1537, Jane Seymour
 May 20, 1536.

died in giving birth to the long-desired heir, who reigned as Edward VI. Cromwell, still busy destroying the monasteries, thought it would help to complete the breach with Rome if Henry married a German Protestant. The Princess Anne of Cleves was reported to be a lady of many attractions. She came to England to marry the

Marriage,
 Jan. 6, 1540.
 Pronounced
 invalid July 9,
 abrogated by
 Parliament
 July 24, 1540.

king, proved to be dull and heavy, and within a few months the Church, through the pliant Cranmer, and then Parliament, pronounced the marriage invalid. Cromwell paid the penalty for disappointing his master. On a charge of having encroached upon

the royal authority he was condemned, not after ordinary trial, but by a special act of Parliament, called a Bill of Attainder; he was not even heard in his own defence, and was sent to the block. In him the one strong man who had favoured Protestant teaching disappeared. Henry's

Marriage on the
 day of Crom-
 well's execution,
 July 28, 1540.

new wife was Catherine Howard, of the family of the Duke of Norfolk, the leader of the party opposed to Cromwell. She was found guilty of gross immorality, and was executed

February 13, 1542. Henry's last matrimonial venture was more fortunate than he deserved. On July 12, 1543, he married Catherine Parr, the widow of Lord Latimer, a good and tactful woman, who survived him.

With so strong a character as Henry in the foreground, we are in danger of looking too exclusively on his

Henry's
 statesmanship.

marriages and executions and of forgetting that in some respects he was a far-seeing statesman. Wales no longer dreamed of independence, and Henry finally effected union by assimilating Welsh and English laws and administration. To conciliate Scotland he tried to marry his son Edward to the little Scottish queen Mary, but France balked a

plan that would have saved Mary from her sad fate on the scaffold. Towards Ireland, too, Henry showed, except in religious policy, a conciliatory spirit. Ireland.

The English were a small minority in that country; the district about Dublin where they ruled was surrounded by a Pale, and beyond the Pale tribal barbarism was supreme. Though even the law courts held that it was no crime for an Englishman to kill an Irishman, the wild life of the Irish attracted the English settlers, and to check intercourse the Parliament of Ireland had passed as early as in 1366 the Statute of Kilkenny, which made intermarriage between the races high treason, and imposed heavy penalties upon any of the English who spoke the Irish tongue, or wore the Irish dress. But the old unrest and strife went on for more than a century, and then to bring Ireland more completely under English control, Henry VII had sent over Sir Edward Poynings with a considerable army. He caused the Irish Parliament to pass in 1494 the famous Poynings' Act, by



HENRY VIII, IN LATER LIFE.

which the laws of the English Parliament were made valid in Ireland, though it had a separate Parliament. The act also surrendered the right of the Irish Parliament to pass any laws not previously approved by the king and his English councils. With such precedents the resolute Henry VIII was certain to do in Ireland what he found he could do in England, though the two countries had widely differing needs. The Irish monasteries were centres of civilization in regions still half barbarous, yet they were desolated, and the relics of saints whom the Irish honoured were burned publicly with every mark of contempt.

Henry summoned a Parliament at Dublin in 1540. With all his despotism he showed the Tudor tact. In this Parliament Irish chieftains sat side by side with the Anglo-Irish; Henry gave them titles in the English form, flattered them, invited them to London, and showed a real desire to unite the Irish under stable government. He took the title of King of Ireland, which implied a recognition of Ireland's separate status, but his religious policy left a wound which has not since been healed.

The years 1544 and 1545 saw Henry again at war with France and Scotland. English plundering expeditions invaded Scotland, and Henry himself crossed to France, took Boulogne, and continued to hold it even after peace was made in 1546.

For the English war meant chiefly more taxes, and there were many murmurs at the "benevolences" which Henry exacted. His financial policy was never wise. In 1529 he had undermined the royal credit by causing Parliament to cancel his debts for forced loans. In 1544 he not only repeated this, but inserted a clause ordering sums that he had paid to be returned. He misused the funds of the monasteries, and debased the coinage so that it contained about half the amount of silver previously used. Prices rose rapidly in consequence, and the poor especially suffered, for their wages did not increase, and the debased coins had but half of the former purchasing power.

In Henry's later days the political situation was also clouded. His daughters, Mary and Elizabeth, had both been declared illegitimate, and in any case no woman had as yet ruled England. Not until the king was forty-six had the darling object of his heart been achieved, of securing a male heir. He was already an old man, with uncertain tenure of life, and the horrors of a minority, which might lead to civil war in contest for the throne, haunted men's minds, and kept the king full of sus-

Henry's financial policy.

Fears in regard to the succession.
Edward VI born Oct. 12, 1537.

picians. Margaret, Countess of Salisbury, daughter of that Clarence whom Edward IV was believed to have drowned in a butt of Malmsey wine, still lived, and she and her sons, Henry Pole, Lord Montacute, and Reginald Pole, afterward Archbishop of Canterbury, were in 1538 accused of a plot to overthrow Henry, and to re-establish the ancient line of York. Reginald Pole escaped, but his brother Henry, his cousin Henry Courtenay, Marquis of Exeter, grandson of Edward IV in the female line, were executed in 1538, and two years afterward, on May 27, 1541, his mother perished on the scaffold. A little later Henry seized the Earl of Surrey, the accomplished poet, and his father, the Duke of Norfolk, for supposed pretensions to the crown; Surrey was beheaded on January 21, 1547, but Henry's death, one week later, saved Norfolk. The danger of the Tudors from some of these persons was real, though time was to prove the dynasty to be so firmly fixed in the affections of the English people that they were willing to be ruled even by its female representatives. For the establishment of this popularity Henry must be given the chief credit; his industry, tact, readiness, affable bearing, and regard for English prejudices, concealed from the nation as a whole many of the vices of his character, and he was popular to the end. His last days were not kingly. He became a great mountain of flesh, and could not walk or stand. He feared death, and showed his belief in the old system, of which he was the ruin, by providing money for perpetual daily masses for his own soul. On January 28, 1547, he died.

Henry VIII was not content with reigning while still alive, but aimed to rule from his grave, and spent his last two days in giving directions to the Earl of Hertford and Sir William Paget. He named a Council of sixteen, of which Hertford, brother of Queen Jane Seymour, and thus the young Edward's uncle, was to be president with very limited

The reversal of
Henry VIII's
policy.

powers. The religious policy of Henry VIII—Roman doctrine without Roman supremacy—was to be continued. At sixteen Henry's son Edward was himself to take up the work of government. But in almost every respect the king's hopes were unrealized: his body was not yet cold before the two counsellors, in a whispered colloquy, agreed that Hertford should become not merely President of the Council, but Protector, with almost regal power. The middle course of Henry VIII was abandoned—inevitably, no doubt; for between the two parties, one for thorough-



EDWARD SEYMOUR, EARL OF
HERTFORD AND LATER
DUKE OF SOMERSET, PRO-
TECTOR (1506 ?–1552).

going Protestantism, the other for reunion with Rome, and each animated by strong passions, it could not survive. Hertford himself, and Cranmer, Archbishop of Canterbury, after him the greatest personage in the state, had firm Protestant convictions. So also had the young king, though he was only a boy of ten. The many families holding appropriated Church lands had obvious reasons for supporting the same views, and as soon as the new government dared, it showed that the break with Rome was complete. To help make the

doctrinal revolution thorough, it invited foreign Protestants to England, and sent to the Tower prelates like Bonner, Bishop of London, and Gardiner, Bishop of Winchester, who defended the Roman system; there they remained during Edward's reign. Parliament made no difficulties. The Latin tongue was abolished from the services of the Church, and Cranmer, aided chiefly, it should seem, by Ridley, who succeeded the displaced Bonner as Bishop of London, drew up a new English service book, issued in 1549, which is still, with some

alterations, the Book of Common Prayer of the Church of England.

In his last days Henry VIII had laid hands on the remaining property used for religious purposes which he could plausibly seize. The chantries had rich endowments for masses, and the guilds large revenues for charitable purposes, and there remained besides many hospitals and similar foundations. The devastation, begun by Henry, was completed under his successor. Except in London, and perhaps a few other places, the guilds, with many beautiful guild halls, now disappeared. The chantries were dissolved, and some of the hospitals, which cared for the poor as well as the sick, were deprived of their revenues, partly because these had been misused. The parish churches had escaped under Henry VIII, who continued in them the old worship. They possessed enormous wealth in gold and silver vessels, jewelled crosses, rings, girdles, and gorgeous vestments, which found no place in the worship authorized by the new Prayer Book of 1549. Though the parish church, with its riches, had belonged to the people, its booty now went mainly to the rich spoiler. The work was done with reckless completeness. There was especial zeal against the many statues which it was thought ministered to idolatry; much rich carving was also destroyed, and before the end of the reign the parish churches were left bare and poor. Hertford soon became Duke of Somerset; Dudley, Lord Lisle, next to Somerset the most prominent man in the Council, took the title of Earl of Warwick; and the wealth of the Church went largely to them and to their friends.

Changes so radical caused inevitable strife. While Henry VIII had not disturbed the religious habits of his people, the advisers of Edward VI seemed bent on going to every extreme of Protestant zeal; social discontent aided the opposition to their religious policy, and soon

they were face to face with a formidable insurrection. In Cornwall and Devon the people demanded the old ceremonies and doctrines; in Norfolk, under Ket, Rebellion, 1549. a rich tanner, they threatened to destroy the upper classes, and demanded social reforms; especially that the commons, inclosed by grasping landholders, should once more be made public property. The danger was real. Somerset, impulsive and kind-hearted, but not the strong man for such a situation, showed a certain sympathy with the social grievances, and it was Warwick who sternly suppressed the rebellion. Thousands perished in actual fighting; the leaders died upon the scaffold, and some priests were hanged in their vestments from their church steeples, with the old service books, which they wished to see restored, tied round their necks.

Within six months of Henry VIII's death Somerset marched into Scotland to force the reluctant Scots to marry their infant queen to England's infant king, won a famous victory at Pinkie on September 10, 1547, burned Leith, and captured Edinburgh and other places. But defeat united the Scots against the marriage, and in August, 1548, Mary, the young queen, was carried off to France to marry the Dauphin ten years later, and to be a menace to the security of England until Elizabeth sent her to a tragic death. Another pet project of Henry VIII thus failed. Somerset's incapacity was soon apparent. His own brother, Lord Seymour, who married Henry VIII's widow, and on her death planned to marry Henry's daughter Elizabeth, tried to raise a revolt and to gain possession of the king, but failed and was executed. Warwick was more successful. He was an abler man than Somerset, and by the end of 1549 had completely undermined the Protector's influence. Two years later, that he might not be in the way of Warwick's ambition, he, too, was exe-

Warwick's
overthrow of
Somerset.

March 20, 1549.

cuted on a trumped-up charge of felony. In 1551 Warwick took the title of Duke of Northumberland. He aimed now at nothing less than the crown of England for his descendants.

Amid the plundering and intrigue of the reign we almost lose sight of the little king himself. Kings are lonely beings, and this royal child was no exception. Like his father, he had a high view of his kingly dignity and little natural affection. He spent much time in study; knew Greek, Latin, French, and perhaps Italian; read daily ten chapters of Scripture with delight; discoursed upon theology, and was zealous for Protestant doctrine. He kept a diary in which great matters of state are noted with intelligence; he was aware of the robbery of the Church that was going on and mentions the amounts that some of those about him secured; perhaps he already intended that the day of reckoning should come. But he was the tool and not the master of the men who acted in

his name. Soon after Somerset's execution, in 1552, it was evident that the king's end, also, was not far off. His nearest of kin were four women. Mary and Elizabeth, Henry's daughters, had each in turn been declared illegitimate, and Mary Stuart, a granddaughter of Henry's elder sister Margaret, had been displaced by Henry himself in the line of succession in favour of Mary, his younger sister, whose claims were now represented by Lady Jane

Character and
death of
Edward VI.

lonely beings, and this royal child was no exception. Like his father, he had a high view of his kingly dignity and little natural affection.



EDWARD VI.

Grey, her granddaughter. By the plan of Northumberland, Lady Jane Grey married his son, Lord Guildford Dudley. The duke was resolved that she should succeed Edward, and to secure the king's support he professed ardent Protestantism. In June, 1553, Edward formally named Lady Jane Grey his successor, and a few weeks later, attacked by both measles and smallpox and threatened with consumption, he died.

Edward's reign, so dreary in its bloodshed and selfish intrigue, is yet momentous, for in it was effected the Protestant Settlement, which the reaction under Church policy.

Mary did not permanently disturb. The Roman Church's influence in Parliament was now weak; there were no longer monasteries to send mitred abbots, and



MARY I.

the House of Lords was composed mainly of Protestant bishops and of peers made rich by Church lands. In 1552 the Prayer-Book of 1549 was superseded by a revision more Protestant in tone, which wholly forbade the mass, and contained Forty-two new Articles of Religion giving legal sanction to Protestant doctrines. In these changes the nation as a whole had little share; they were due to lead-

ers like Cranmer, Somerset, and Northumberland. Probably in their hearts the mass of the people resented innovations that disturbed old habits; and the spoliation of the Church bore heavily upon the poor, since the new men who

secured her lands proved rapacious landlords. Indeed, the reign of Edward VI was a dark time for the common people. The debased coinage made prices very high, and the war with France and Scotland increased the distress, for it brought a new burden of taxation and the loss of Boulogne.

Henry VIII's will provided that Mary, his eldest daughter, though by law illegitimate since the marriage

The succession of Mary, the first female ruler of England.

with Catherine had been declared null and void,

should succeed to the throne if Edward VI left no direct heirs, and it was soon evident that to her and not to Lady Jane Grey the

nation turned. Northumberland proclaimed Lady Jane Grey queen, but was too late in trying to seize Mary, for already she was among the men of Norfolk and Suffolk, and the troops he summoned would not fight against the Tudor claimant. Hitherto England had not known a woman's sovereignty, but loyalty to the ruling line, now become a national passion, overcame all other feelings, and within a fortnight Mary was queen, and Northumberland, Lady Jane Grey, and their chief supporters were in prison.

Mary, now in her thirty-ninth year, had suffered much. She had not even been permitted to see her dying mother,

Unpopularity of Mary's marriage.

and her best friends had perished on the scaffold. It is hardly strange that she in turn

clung to her mother's religion with the fanatical devotion of her Spanish blood. Unlike her father, she failed to keep in touch with her people, and when resolved to marry, she made the unpopular choice of



PHILIP II OF SPAIN (1527-1598).

Philip of Spain, son of the Emperor Charles V. The English not only feared that a foreigner should rule both their queen and them, but they especially disliked the prospect that England should be drawn into wars to support the



HENRY GREY,
DUKE OF SUFFOLK (D. 1554).

policy of Spain. When Parliament in vain protested against the union, a threatening revolt broke out in 1554 led by Sir Thomas Wyatt, a Kentish gentleman, who was supported by many of high rank. The rebels marched on London in formidable numbers, and for a time the queen was in danger, but Wyatt was finally checked, hundreds of prisoners fell into Mary's hands, and the remaining rebels soon scattered. It is remarkable that the queen did

not treat the lesser rebels with great severity, but her hand fell heavily upon those of high rank. Northumberland had already been executed, and had
Aug. 22, 1553.

proved on the scaffold a craven to his Protestant professions; others more innocent now followed him, chief among them the gentle, learned, and beautiful Lady Jane Grey; her husband, Lord Guildford Dudley; her father, the Duke of Suffolk; and her uncle, Sir Thomas Grey.

For a time it seemed as if the Princess Elizabeth herself might share their fate.

The sorrows of Mary's life had been associated with the breach with Rome, and she felt sure that for herself and for her country there could be no peace or prosperity until it was healed. Almost her first use of authority was to restore Bonner, Bishop of London, Gardiner,

Bishop of Winchester, and others deposed under Edward ; and soon Protestant bishops, like Cranmer, Ridley, and

Mary's policy
regarding
religion.

Latimer, were in prison. Parliament, obedient as always to Tudor sovereigns, met and restored the religious services as Henry VIII

had left them ; a little later it repealed all the legislation directed against the Pope's authority, and England, after five years of Protestant ascendancy, was back in the old paths as far as Parliament could bring her. It was to be the fate of the unhappy Mary to fail in all she undertook. From the ease with which Protestantism was officially overthrown she imagined that by a little stern firmness it could be finally uprooted. She singled out for special attack the doctrinal teachers, and finally burned for heresy the bishops Cranmer, Ridley, Latimer, and Hooper, and dozens of minor Protestant leaders. Face to face with death, these men did not recant as Northumberland and

Oct. 16, 1555.

others of nobler birth had done. In the flames

at Oxford Latimer cheered the weaker Ridley, his fellow-victim, by prophesying that their death should kindle a light in England that should never burn out. At

March 21, 1556.

Oxford, too, a little later, Cranmer showed great courage, and thrust first into the fire the

hand that had signed a weak denial of his real views. Mary burned women and even children, and they, too, did not shrink from the ordeal. Her policy was to hold the executions in various centres, that terror might strike the hearts of the heretics all over the kingdom ; but the crowds looked upon the burnings with pity rather than terror, and learned respect for a persecuted creed formerly associated with spoliation and selfish ambition. Nearly three hundred victims went to the stake. Mary continued the work to the very end of her reign, for she feared that God would not smile upon her until the land was wholly purged of heresy. She made her cousin, Reginald Pole, Archbishop of Canterbury ; his counsels did not work for mod-

eration, but even he abandoned any attempt to deprive the owners of Church lands of what had now been private property for more than twenty years, and the Pope finally absolved England without their restoration. To
 Nov. 30, 1554. this day descendants of the new landholders retain possessions of which the monasteries were despoiled.

Mary was no more fortunate in foreign than in domestic policy. Her union with Philip brought in the end the dreaded war with France, and, incited by
 Failure of Mary's policy. France, the Scots invaded England. Calais had been held by the English since Edward III took it in 1347, but in 1558, after a sharp siege, it fell, and thus was lost the last foot of ground



REGINALD POLE,
 ARCHBISHOP OF CANTER-
 BURY (1500-1558).

that England held on the Continent. The nation was angry, and the queen, who for years had suffered from headache and palpitation of the heart, was oppressed by this added burden. "When I am dead and gone," she said, "thou shalt find Calais lying upon my heart." She had dropsy, and possibly physical disorders affected her mind. At the last she was intensely unpopular, and probably only the certain nearness of her death saved England from revolt. She died on November 17, 1558. Perhaps Mary has not received due credit for her good qualities. She began her reign by lightening taxes and improving the debased coinage. She was cruel not by nature, but by policy, and her munificence, her interest in education, her ceaseless industry, often from daybreak to midnight, arouse at least pity for her failure. Her wars left the finances in a desperate condition, and her marriage with Philip so stirred the insular prejudices of the English that they identified reconciliation with Rome

and the sway of the foreigner in England; patriotism and Protestantism for them came to mean the same thing.

Mary desired passionately to bear a son to succeed her, but she died childless, and the nation turned unmistakably to Elizabeth, the daughter of Henry VIII and Anne Boleyn. Elizabeth's early associations were ill-fitted to awaken the best

The character
of Elizabeth.

qualities of what proved to be a very strong nature.

In her infancy the axe of the executioner left her motherless. Her stern father had little love for the child of a miserable marriage, and she found no tenderness in him. Yet, as a king's daughter, she had the best education of the time, and could speak French, Italian, Latin, and Greek, and even read Hebrew. She had a man's mind, a body as untiring as her remote ancestor, Henry II, and,

like him, the passionate temper that made her burst into oaths and fling the nearest object at the head of any one who irritated her. Grave statesmen trembled in her presence; she was as relentless as Henry VIII, and as profoundly conscious of her authority as sovereign. "Princes," she said, "transact business in a princely way and with a princely understanding such as private persons can not have." Those who spoke to her as well as those upon whom her eye fell dropped to their knees. Covers were laid at her table with ceremony not unlike that of the priest officiating at the altar. But with all her strength, Eliza-



ELIZABETH.

Note the elaborate dress.

beth was a woman, sprightly, fickle, coquettish, delighting to be thought beautiful, and with a vain and extravagant fondness for dress. Sex played a great part in her statecraft. She encouraged lovers in order to use them as pawns in her political game, and her grave advisers sometimes outlined the terms of affection which she should use to a suitor. For twenty years she kept Europe wondering whom she would marry. There was much scandal about her moral conduct, but it has probably little justification; her nature was cold, and she was never mastered by passion. In everything except dress she showed a parsimony almost pitiful. It had its nobler side, for it enabled her by twenty-four years of saving to pay off her father's debts; and by acting as her own watchful minister of finance, and refraining from such extravagances as the building of great palaces, she lightened the nation's burden of taxation. Often she made her ministers serve her at their own expense; Burghley paid the charges of a mission to Scotland in her interest, and from others she demanded similar costly duties, showing to them in return many an unroyal meanness. Perhaps in this she wrought better than either she or they dreamed, for under her Englishmen learned to embark upon great enterprises at their own risk—a quality that has led them all over the world. It strengthened her hold upon her subjects that she was the island queen who never put foot in any realm but her own. Her whole life was spent in England; she might have added Holland to her dominions, but England was the only world for which she cared; there she resented any claim that invaded her complete supremacy, and perhaps this, more than anything else, drew her to the Protestant cause against the Pope.

When Mary died, Philip II wrote to say that, though the plan involved personal sacrifice, if Elizabeth would uphold the Catholic religion he would marry her. Obviously, he expected her ready assent, but his offer was re-

jected. Elizabeth studiously avoided any act recognising the Pope's authority; she allowed the mass for a time, but after a few weeks the epistle and gospel, which the Roman Church required to be in Latin, were read in English, as well as the litany. She soon demanded from bishops an oath recognising her supremacy in the Church. Those who refused lost their sees; among them Bonner, Bishop of London, Mary's chief agent in persecution. Many places in the Church happened to be vacant. By December, 1558, death left ten sees unoccupied and Elizabeth appointed to them bishops who would do her will. The Book of Common Prayer was reissued, but with alterations in the direction of less uncompromising Protestantism. It was said that the Pope would approve of the book if England would acknowledge his supremacy, but upon this point Elizabeth was firm. She did indeed give up the title of Head of the Church, but took instead that of Supreme Governor. She liked elaborate ritual, and sometimes laughed at her secretary Cecil's Protestant convictions, but she would not bend to the Pope's authority. Soon, under very severe penalties, not only public but even private masses were prohibited, and when four years had passed the break with Rome was complete. Thirty-nine Articles of Religion to which the clergy were obliged to give their assent, proved to those holding Roman doctrine veritable "forty stripes save one," and made Protestant tenets compulsory. The oath of supremacy of 1563 involved a full assent to Elizabeth's authority in the Church, and no one could refuse to take it without incurring the awful penalties of treason. Even the clergy appear to have objected little to the break with Rome, for of nearly ten thousand less than two hundred refused the oath of supremacy. Clergy and laity alike desired tranquillity and peace, and these Elizabeth gave them. She soon brought to a close Mary's inglorious war with France and Scotland, and the treaty of Edinburgh,

Acts of uniform-
ity and suprem-
acy, 1559.

signed in July, 1560, began a new era of peace which lasted for eight or nine years, while every year of the reigns of Edward VI and Mary had been marked by war or disaster.

During her troubled childhood Elizabeth had learned caution. With a rare gift of discernment, she called to her councils men of profound sagacity, like Sir William Cecil, afterward Lord Burghley, and Sir Thomas Walsingham. Burghley was sedate, far-sighted, free from passion, unscrupulous, but

Elizabeth's
counsellors.



SIR WILLIAM CECIL, LORD BURGHEY
(1520-1598).

wholly true to his royal mistress, who always treated him with more respect than she usually gave to her servants. But no single minister ruled under Elizabeth as Wolsey had ruled in the time of her father. In her own hands she held the strings of statecraft, and her will was supreme; the Parliament, at least early in the reign, was eager to obey her slightest wish, and was specially favourable to her Church policy.

Many dangers threatened Elizabeth. The Pope would not recognise her as queen, and her next of kin, Mary

Elizabeth's
dangers.

Stuart, the young queen of Scotland, and also of France, as the wife of Francis II, assumed the arms and titles of the sovereigns of England; at the court of France the ushers cried before her "Place for the Queen of England." Mary's attitude seemed

the assassin's warrant to put Elizabeth out of the way as a usurper. In 1561 Cecil told her that her food, her dress, even the perfume that she inhaled, should be carefully examined for poison, and that the back door of her apartments should be guarded against assassins. Before such perils the queen was at her best. Fearlessly she did her duty, and in her protection Cecil played a deep game. The plundered secrets of European powers were brought to him by supposed highwaymen, who had robbed the foreign envoys journeying in England. It was a time when few could



MARY STUART (1542-1587).

be trusted, and his own agents sometimes betrayed him; yet he was so able to balance threatening forces that not until 1569 did the storm begin to break upon Elizabeth. Then she was understood by her people, and could rely wholly upon their support.

Momentous events happened meanwhile. In France the two religious parties plunged into civil war, while in the Netherlands Philip II was trying with ruthless severity to crush the revolted Protestants. Francis II died, and in 1561 Mary Stuart, his widow, not yet nineteen, returned to Scotland to find Protestantism the religion of the land and the public exercises of her own faith forbidden. Stormy days followed. Mary had tact and skill, but she was imprudent, and, unlike Elizabeth, was mastered by her feelings. She fell in love at sight with her kinsman Lord Darnley, a brainless boy, married him and gave him the title of king; but soon he was plotting against his own wife, and

Religious strife
in Europe,
1560-'70.

in February, 1567, was murdered by a party led by the Earl of Bothwell; whether Mary was privy to the crime is still a matter of keen debate. There is no doubt that with Bothwell she fell madly in love and was soon closely allied, and he caused scandal by divorcing his wife to marry her. Renewed civil war followed, and on May 16, 1568, Mary, defeated and in danger among her own subjects, fled across the Solway, and took refuge in Elizabeth's dominions. Thus began, when she was only twenty-five, her long captivity, to end on the scaffold nineteen years later.

Mary Queen of
Scots takes
refuge in
England.

To anti-Protestant Europe Mary was England's queen; it was not strange that efforts should be made to free her and to overthrow Elizabeth, and a few English nobles were soon engaged in a dangerous plot. Mary, free by Bothwell's death to take a fourth husband, was to marry the Duke of Norfolk, who at thirty-one had already buried three rich wives and now aspired to a queen's hand. Norfolk was a poor creature who did little, but the Earls of Northumberland and Westmoreland took up arms in the north in November, 1569, and with about six thousand followers seized Durham. Certain that Eng-

Plots to put
Mary on the
English throne.

Insurrection
in the north.

land was with them they hurried southward, declaring the Roman Catholic faith restored and expecting to release Mary and proclaim her queen. But England did not rise; Mary's jailers got her out of the way of her rescuers, and Cecil was well prepared to meet the rebels. Some difficult campaigning followed, but early in 1570 Lord Hundson defeated Lord Daere, the ablest soldier on the rebel side, in the battle of the Chelt, and then all real danger was past. Elizabeth showed the Tudor relentlessness. The leaders escaped, but on the village greens of the north dangled in chains the bodies of six or seven hundred peasants, the victims of rash plots in which they had really no

part. Until the great civil war seventy years later England saw no further rebellion against the crown.

The rebels claimed that their failure was due to the absence of the Pope's public sanction. Pope Pius IV had moved cautiously against Elizabeth, but Pius V, who became Pope in 1566, was a stern foe of compromise. On February 25, 1570, he issued a bull which is the final document in the breach between England and Rome. It fully absolved Elizabeth's subjects from their allegiance; henceforth no one could obey the Pope and at the same time be loyal to the queen. In 1571 the English Parliament retorted by enacting that Elizabeth's subjects who joined the Church of Rome and the priest who brought about their reconciliation were guilty of high treason. Religious passions were all aflame. Compromise was no longer possible. In the Netherlands Alva was butchering thousands of Protestant victims; in France the massacre of a great many Huguenots in cold blood on St. Bartholomew's Day, 1572, revealed the awful depths of religious hatred, and aroused in England angry sympathy for those who suffered. Elizabeth herself used rack and torture as no sovereign before her had used them. The Roman Catholics protested that they were persecuted for their faith. Elizabeth and her advisers said it was for their treason, and religion was, in truth, so mixed up with politics that it was not easy to define the precise limits of each. In 1571 Ridolfi, an Italian banker in London, was leading in a new attempt to assassinate Elizabeth. Alva was to throw a force from the Netherlands into England and to help make Mary queen. But Burghley, by a watchfulness little short of marvellous, tracked the plot to its sources, and the vain and foolish Norfolk, who was involved, went at last to the block in 1572.

In time Elizabeth detached France from Mary's cause; in the very year of St. Bartholomew began her love-mak-

ing to win French support. For no less than thirteen years she professed to be about to marry the Duke of

The perils of
Elizabeth.

Alençon, brother of the King of France, and there was a long correspondence between the two, sometimes in terms of extravagant affection. Alençon, very small, poek-marked, ugly, and profligate, visited England, but Elizabeth had probably not the remotest intention of marrying him. Her sprightly arts could delay, but they could not permanently check,

The Roman
Catholic
missionaries
in England.

deep-seated perils. The Roman Church was resolved to reconquer England. At Douay in Artois, the seat of a university founded by Philip II, William Allen, afterward cardinal, founded a college for the education of young



WILLIAM ALLEN, CARDINAL
(1532-1594).



THE DUKE OF ALENÇON
(1554-1584).

Englishmen as Roman Catholic missionaries to their native land. Allen's deliberate aim was to invite persecution that should compel the English Catholics, believed on the Continent to be very numerous, to break into open rebellion. In his view every martyrdom would be a cause of rejoicing, and after 1574 numbers of his seminarists were doing their perilous work. The first missionary was caught and hanged and

quartered in 1577 as a traitor. In 1580 the Jesuits, led by two Englishmen, Parsons and Campion, joined in the

work. They aroused Elizabeth's deepest anger; and torture, execution, and the hacking to pieces of the bodies of the priests went on for the rest of her reign. Had these martyrs not seemed to those loyal to the queen to be the agents of a foreign power, their sufferings, borne with calm heroism, would have stirred a pity that was lost in the strength of national feeling against their aims!

In the Netherlands, as in England, Protestantism was fighting for its life. Ties of sympathy drew the people of the two countries together, but Elizabeth, with her strong sense of the rights of monarchs, would not unreservedly aid the

Elizabeth's
final defiance
of Spain.

revolt of the Dutch against a fellow sovereign. Sometimes she gave secret help, but ever grudgingly. In 1581 the seven revolted provinces, making the first successful declaration of independence of modern times, refused longer to recognise Philip II, and looked about for a new ruler. Anxious to secure the support both of France and of England, they finally offered the sovereignty to Elizabeth's would-be husband, the Duke of Alençon. He accepted it, but was no fit ruler for a free and heroic people, and ere long

he left the country, and William of Orange again became the leader of the Dutch cause. When in 1584 he fell by an assassin's hand Elizabeth consented at last to be the protector of the provinces, and sent, in 1585, her favourite, the Earl of Leicester, to govern in her name. For the repayment of her outlay she took every guarantee that narrow parsimony could exact, but the consequences of her action were wider than she had imagined. Philip of Spain was at length aroused. For nearly thirty years



ROBERT DUDLEY,
EARL OF LEICESTER
(1582?-1588).

Elizabeth had so balanced France against Spain, had so hesitated and drawn back now from one side, now from the other, that Philip found it hard to make up his mind, but when she gave open help to rebels against his authority he resolved upon a mighty effort to destroy her.

By striking another blow Elizabeth soon re-enforced this decision. In 1586 was discovered the last of the

The last plot
in favour of
Mary Stuart.

many conspiracies in support of Mary Stuart. Like William of Orange, Elizabeth was to be killed, and then Mary was to become queen.


Some Englishmen, led, it seems, not by Babington, a gentleman of means after whom the plot is named, but by Ballard, a priest, joined in the scheme which had the sanction of Philip and of the Pope. Without doubt Mary gave it a guarded approval. She was no longer in close confinement at Tutbury Castle, but was living at Chartley Manor, and purposely, it seems, was given an opportunity to communicate with her friends. There was a traitor among the plotters. At the right moment Elizabeth arrested the leaders, and Babington, Ballard, and others, soon, with awful tortures, paid the last grim penalty.

The question now was what to do with Mary Stuart. As a plotter of murder should she also die? To put

The execution of
Mary Stuart.

a sovereign—Queen of Scotland and Queen Dowager of France—even on trial was wholly without precedent in an age when monarchs were still thought responsible to God alone. Mary was sent to the Castle of Fotheringay, and a commission of peers and judges went down to examine her. There, in October, 1586, crippled with rheumatism, she hobbled to her place of trial, and pitted her keen woman's wit against some forty grave men, eager to entrap her. In an agony of doubt and hesitation, Elizabeth recalled the commissioners at the end of the second day to sit at London under her own supervision; they found Mary guilty, and

it remained for the queen and Parliament to name the penalty. The Lords and Commons petitioned the Queen to put Mary to death. Elizabeth's dilemma was terrible. To take the decisive act of executing Mary might unite Europe against England; to spare her might encourage new plots in her interest. After weeks of doubt, Elizabeth signed Mary's death-warrant, but still showed unwillingness to give the final order for execution. In fact she wished others to take this responsibility, that she might




FOTHERINGAY IN 1718.

The castle in which Mary was imprisoned stood on the hill at the right, and was pulled down by order of Mary's son, James I.

afterward blame them, and herself escape the discredit of the act. She sank so low as to ask Mary's keeper, Sir Amyas Paulet, to murder her, but the stern Puritan refused. Davison, her secretary, applied to the commissioners who had tried Mary: they decided that since the queen had signed the warrant, the execution must follow, and on Tuesday, February 7, 1587, the Earls of Shrewsbury and Kent went down to Fotheringay and told the unfortunate queen that she must die on the next day. Though Mary had talked, as so many talk, of desiring death, she


had not believed that Elizabeth would take her life. The first shock of the news unnerved her, but in the end she met her fate with the firmness of a martyr.



EXECUTION OF MARY STUART.

The manners of that age are happily not ours: she was denied the ministrations of a confessor of her own faith, while she rejected with scorn those of the Protestant Dean of Peterborough. On the morning of the 8th a crowd gathered in the great hall at Fotheringay. Mary, robed in black satin, walked with queenly dignity to the scaffold.

When she declared that she died a Catholic the Dean of Peterborough began to pray aloud, but Mary, kneeling, raised her voice, and soon silenced him by the vehemence of her intercessions; at the fatal moment, she threw off her outer robes and stood arrayed in red from head to foot. There was indeed something of stage-play in her elaborate dressing for her part, and the Government was determined that no relics of her martyrdom should be preserved for reverence. A



HOLDING UP MARY'S HEAD AFTER EXECUTION.


great fire blazed in the hall on that February day. Mary's body was stripped, and everything touched by her blood

was burned, including her dress, her beads, and even the cloth upon the scaffold. When the news of the execution reached Elizabeth she broke into violent weeping, declared that Davison had disobeyed her commands, and sent him at once to the Tower. War with Scotland and France was imminent. Mary's son demanded that if Elizabeth herself were innocent, she should punish the guilty officers who had dared to carry out the execution. Davison was tried, imprisoned and ruined. No one believed Elizabeth's protests, yet they helped to make union against her difficult.

On the last night of life Mary wrote to Philip, urging him to invade England, and to exact vengeance for her death. It was, she said, God's quarrel. Philip was now allied with the Guises, leaders of the Catholic party in France, and they agreed

The Spanish
Armada, 1588.


upon a plan. The Pope promised help in money, and in 1588 the mighty Armada that was to conquer England set out. For three centuries its defeat has been the theme in England of patriotic outbursts; and the danger appeared real enough, for Parma, now Philip's commander in



AN ENGLISH SHIP OF WAR, 1588.

Holland, was ready to throw thousands of trained soldiers across the Channel; France and Spain acted together; Catholic Europe was embittered by Mary's death, and, above all, Elizabeth seemed unprepared. Yet that the Armada would fail was hardly doubtful from the first. The English Catholics proved on the whole loyal to Elizabeth against Philip, and neither France, to secure whose crown was among Philip's ambitions, nor the Pope would help

the King of Spain unreservedly. Nor was the Armada itself formidable on the sea. It numbered about one hundred and thirty ships, some of them huge. Their high towers and broad bows were imposing, but they worked



AN ENGLISH SHIP OF PRIVATE OWNERSHIP, ABOUT 1588.

(The "Black Pinnace" belonging to Sir Philip Sydney, which carried his body from Holland to England, 1586.)

badly to windward, and were also easy targets for the skilful English gunners. The smaller English vessels, with lower hulls and sharp bows, could readily outmanœuvre the Spaniards, and while in the English ships gentlemen drew ropes, and often worked as hard as the common sailors, the caste of rank divided the Spanish officers from their men. An English navy in one sense did not exist, for the queen could send only some thirty ships against the Armada; but private owners sent five times this number, and about sixteen thousand English sailors were arrayed against nine thousand on the Spanish side; the Spanish had in addition about twenty thousand soldiers on board, but at sea these were only an encumbrance. While the English knew thoroughly the seas on which they fought, their assailants were without pilots. Yet so majestic seemed the Spanish host, that at Lisbon, in May, 1588, Philip

christened it "The Invincible Armada." Not only Spaniards, but Portuguese, Italians, and renegade English, Irish, and Scots, helped to swell its imposing array.

After long delay, the Armada finally took leave of Spain on the 22d of July, and from the ships' masts floated the cross as the emblem of a holy crusade.

The defeat of
the Armada.

Between the coast of Cornwall and Spain the seas are notoriously stormy: the Armada was baffled by contrary winds, and not until the 30th was it off the Lizard, the extreme point of Cornwall. Then began its real troubles. The English fleet, commanded by Lord Howard of Effingham, seconded by such tried sea-dogs as Drake and Hawkins, sallied forth from Plymouth, and their smaller and faster ships terribly harassed the Spaniards. The hostile fleet aimed to reach the coast of Holland, and from there to escort to England Parma's transports, carrying a great force. But often there was too little wind, sometimes there was too much, and before the great ships could anchor off Calais, the English had already made valuable captures, and secured a much needed supply of ammunition. While the Spaniards lay at the Calais anchorage Drake planned a great stroke; at midnight, when the wind was rising, and the tide favourable, he sent eight blazing hulls to drift down among the Spaniards. They had no time even to raise anchor; there was something like panic, and the Spanish commander, the Duke of Medina Sidonia, ordered the ships to cut their cables and to stand out for open water. He expected to resume his position at daylight, but so difficult a move was full of peril: the ships could not work



CHARLES HOWARD.

Lord Howard of Effingham
and later Earl of Nottingham
(1536-1624).

back to their old anchorage, and as the day wore on the wind rose to a gale. The Spaniards were in danger of drifting helplessly upon a lee shore, while the English ships, led chiefly by Drake, kept pouring in a deadly and rapid fire at close range: they sank some ships and battered others with such awful slaughter that blood flowed from the scuppers. In spite of themselves, the Spanish were driven northward; panic spread among the soldiers and sailors, and even when, after a day or two, the weather moderated, they dared not sail back to meet the dreaded English who were blocking the way. When nearly one third of the host was already killed or wounded, Medina Sidonia decided to sail northward round Scotland and Ireland, and so to make his way home as best he could: he had still about a hundred ships, but his men's courage was gone, and they were haunted by deadly sickness. Most of the ships rounded the north of Scotland, but supplies and water gave out. In search of food some of them entered Irish ports, where they were attacked by the wild Irish and killed in thousands, and by the English officials in Ireland many others were put to death. The sea, too, claimed its victims; at Sligo, on five miles of shore, eleven hundred bodies of drowned Spaniards were counted. One third of Medina Sidonia's force reached Spain, but the pestilence contracted in the ships carried off the greater part even of these survivors.


The news of the disaster spread only slowly, and Philip's dull mind was long in grasping its real meaning. Meanwhile the English suffered grievously from the parsimony of the queen. To meet the array of Spain she allowed to the ships provisions for a week and powder for only one day's hard fighting; even of stores and ammunition taken from the enemy she required the strictest account, and for want of proper clothes, food, and care, many of her defenders died. It was not Elizabeth's fore-

Elizabeth's
treatment of
her defenders.

sight that won success. Victory was due to the spirit and courage of private gentlemen like Burghley, who equipped considerable forces at their own expense. In the face of foreign aggression even deep religious differences were half forgotten, and the Spaniards, had they landed, would have been met at every step by dogged obstinacy that must have proved fatal to them. It is doubtful that Lord Howard of Effingham, who led the English on the sea, was a Roman Catholic; it is not doubtful that Englishmen of that faith stood by their queen in the hour of trial, and that the patriotism aroused by the Armada finally ruined the Roman Catholic cause in England.

Elizabeth had no enthusiasm for Protestant doctrine, and was resolved to destroy both Protestant and Roman Catholic opposition to her policy. She reformed, but would not abolish, the old ecclesiastical system, which still included government by bishops and the use, in public worship, of the surplice and other vestments and of written prayers. Many wished radical changes, and denounced

Elizabeth's
policy towards
Protestant non-
conformity.



THE MAP REPRESENTS THE PROPORTION OF CATHOLICS AT THE PRESENT TIME.

England's overwhelming Protestantism dates from the time of the Armada.

the retention of so much that belonged to Rome. In the "Mar-prelate" tracts, issued during the reign by the extreme Protestant party, already called the "Puritans," the convocation of the clergy was called a "house of devils," and the Archbishop of Canterbury, "Beelzebub, the chief of the devils." A pleasantry of the time was to call Anglican doctors of divinity "doctors of deviltry." Cartwright, the leader of the party in the Church which favoured Presbyterianism, pronounced worthy of death the so-called "heretics" who opposed him, and showed what might be expected if his party got the upper hand. Many Puritans remained within the Church in the hope of completing further reforms, but some withdrew. Robert Browne, a relative of Cecil, was the leader of the most important group of these "Separatists." It is not easy to estimate their numbers, but they became steadily more formidable, and in the next century overthrew for a time both Church and throne. To advise her in the government of the Church, Elizabeth appointed an Ecclesiastical Commission; by 1565 her Church policy was defined in certain "Advertisements" issued by Parker, Archbishop of Canterbury; and henceforth the scruples of the Puritan clergy met with no respect. In the presence of the archbishop and other bishops at London, a former objector named Cole stood arrayed in the surplice and other vestments which the Puritans hated, and the clergy were required to declare briefly in writing, on the spot, and without equivocation, whether they would or would not conform to this model. Obedience, so exacted, carried with it no conviction; but the alternative to obedience was to cut loose from the Church and to incur the penalties of treason for denying the royal supremacy in ecclesiastical matters.

Parker and Grindal, successive Archbishops of Canterbury, were not persecutors; but when, in 1583, Whitgift became Archbishop the Separatists experienced every extreme of persecution. The Ecclesiastical Commission,

hitherto made use of as a temporary board, became in 1583 a permanent body of more than forty clergymen and laymen, clothed with the full powers of the crown in ecclesiastical matters. Henceforth known as the Court of High Commission, it enforced severe discipline within the Church, supervised the work of the schools and colleges, inquired into the private life of the clergy, and fined, imprisoned, or deprived them at will. In 1583 two Separatists, Thacker and Copping, were hanged for distributing Browne's books. Then for ten years the Puritans had comparative peace, though the Romanists were still hanged, sometimes in batches of a dozen at a time. But in 1593 Parliament took new action. To dispute the queen's ecclesiastical authority, or to attend unauthorized religious meetings, or to refuse to go to church, was now to incur the penalty of imprisonment; if within three months the accused persons did not conform to the Established Church, they were to leave the realm; if they failed finally to comply with the law, they were to be hanged. After this act was passed, the work of repression came within the jurisdiction of common law judges and courts. Henry Barrow, John Greenwood, and John Penry, all men of education, were hanged in the spring of 1593, and many others died in prison. Persecution often promotes instead of silencing religious dissent; the Independents increased in numbers, and when Elizabeth died she left to James and to James's unhappy son a problem solved only after civil war and revolution. The solution—that of mutual toleration—would have been acceptable to few on either side in the early days of the struggle. But persecution wrought a good of which Elizabeth and her advisers did not dream. It deepened religious conviction; it made many Englishmen restless at home, and ultimately in the next reign drove them abroad to found in the wilds of America states dominated by new views of religious and civil polity.

The story of the Elizabethan seamen, which is connected not remotely with the religious strife of the time, has the fascination of new adventure. On Elizabeth's accession, Spain and Portugal were the only European states with dominions across the seas, and almost from the outset her seamen attacked Spain. International law hardly existed, piracy was almost respectable, and the lust of gain was fortified by religious passion, which justified any attack upon Spain. The most notable of the English "sea-dogs" was John Hawkins, the founder of the English slave-trade. In the Spanish-American colonies the natives began, for some unexplained reason, to die off like flies soon after the Spanish conquest. The Spaniards found that the African negro was useful as a substitute, and the trade in these slaves assumed great importance, and was guarded as a strict monopoly. But Hawkins desired a share in it, and in 1562 he seized several hundreds of negroes on the west coast of Africa and carried them to America. The planters eagerly bought them at prices lower, no doubt, than the monopoly permitted, and Hawkins made handsome profits. A second expedition was successful, but a third, in 1567, proved a failure, for Hawkins fell in with a superior Spanish force and lost many men and much property, though he and his young nephew, Francis Drake, got safely back to England. Henceforth Drake becomes the leader in the assaults upon Spain. He was not, like Hawkins, a trader, but rather a naval freebooter, acting usually with the covert sanction of his sovereign. He haunted the Spanish Main, as the sea adjacent to the American continent was called, and sometimes secured rich booty. The gold and silver of the Pacific coast of America were brought by the Spaniards to the Isthmus of Panama and carried across, usually on mules, to the Atlantic side to be shipped to Europe. Drake resolved to invade the Pacific coast, which was still a Spanish preserve. He

The Elizabethan
seamen.

set out in 1577, worked his way for sixteen days through the tortuous Straits of Magellan, and then, in his one remaining ship, was tossed by a fierce storm for fifty-three days on the limitless waters south of Cape Horn, which he was, perhaps, the first to discover. Finally, sailing northward, he found it easy to enter and plunder the Spanish seaports on the Pacific, where foreign marauders had been hitherto unknown. He raised the English flag on a spot probably within the present State of California, and, long before New England was founded, called the country "New Albion." He had a naïve plan to get back into the Atlantic by a sea-passage at the north of the American continent; but, failing to find it, he resolved to reach home by going round Asia and Africa, and in 1580 he arrived in England, having sailed round the world. His voyage proved momentous; he had carried the English flag into new regions, and Englishmen felt henceforth that the whole world was open to their maritime enterprise.



SIR FRANCIS DRAKE
(1545-1596).

During the forty-four years of Elizabeth's reign, Parliament was called together but thirteen times; there was thus on an average a session only once in each period of three and a half years. Meeting so rarely, it was impossible that it should control the policy of the Government. Elizabeth said that already there were laws enough, and she had no desire to see Parliament busy in making new ones. What she expected from it was votes of money, and her parsimony made her in some degree independent even of this. On the whole, she showed great tact in dealing with successive

Parliament
under Elizabeth.

Parliaments. They tried to interfere in her Church policy, protested against her grants of monopolies, and showed in other ways a disposition to make their power real. When obliged to give way, Elizabeth did it with a grace that won their hearts. Throughout her reign Parliament was strongly Protestant, but toward the end we find Puritanism becoming unpopular, perhaps owing both to the strong pressure of the crown and to the narrow vehemence of the Puritans themselves.

The greatest event of the later days of Elizabeth was a revolt in Ireland, where things had gone badly since Henry VIII's time. Ireland was supposed, like England, to have become Protestant, but no attempt had been made to teach Protestant doctrines; even Mary could find no Protestant heresy there, and the people clung fervently to the old faith.

Events in
Ireland.



ROBERT DEVEREUX, EARL OF ESSEX
(1567-1601).

But differences of race are even more vital than those of faith, and it was the Catholic Mary who began to plant English settlers in Ireland and to remodel the country on English lines. The Irish were suspicious of the attempts to Anglicize their country, and in Elizabeth's reign three bloody rebellions broke out. They made parts of the country little less than a shambles, and

the terrible character of the problem at last led Elizabeth to send to Ireland the Earl of Essex, the favoured courtier

of her later years. The last and most formidable of the rebels was the great Earl of Tyrone. Elizabeth, who shared the English contempt and dislike for the Irish, sternly forbade Essex to make terms with Tyrone without her consent. But Essex, spoiled by favour, was rash and headstrong. He treated with Tyrone; it was charged that he had promised to restore papal supremacy in Ireland, and finally when he returned to England without leave Elizabeth's anger burst forth. The earl himself made things worse by his folly. Madly jealous of rivals at court, he took up arms in the hope of forcing Elizabeth to call a new Parliament and to change her advisers. The wild scheme completely failed, and for his treason Essex went to the block in 1601.

Essex's death left Robert Cecil, son of the great Burghley, supreme in Elizabeth's councils, but her own end was near, and she died in 1603.

The death of
Elizabeth.

Throughout her reign she had been frankly worldly, with little delicacy or scruple. The language of piety on her lips had no very deep meaning, and for the quiet pleasures of art and literature she showed no taste. She danced, hunted, dressed elaborately, and almost to the very end seemed to take pleasure in the gaieties of the court. Yet her last years must have been wretched. There was no one of her own rank near her and she was lonely and often melancholy and peevish. With all her faults Elizabeth had the quality that a great minister, a descendant, too, of Burghley, ascribed to Victoria, that of understanding thoroughly the mind of her people. She saw what was practicable in politics and in religion and did it. Under her England faced and overcame difficulties of enormous magnitude, and in meeting them she gained, though it would be too much to say that she held to the end, the passionate love of her subjects. A spirit of independence was abroad, and Parliament was beginning at the last to assume a new tone which her im-

perious temper could hardly brook. Yet she remained a despot. It was under the two kings who succeeded her that the struggle between the new and the old spirit advanced to the climax of revolution.

SUMMARY OF DATES

The Renaissance movement was at its height when Henry VIII came to the throne. Erasmus, the leader in spreading the new learning, visited Henry VIII, but foreign wars attracted chief attention. In **August, 1513**, the French lost the **Battle of the Spurs**, and in **September the Scots were overwhelmed at Flodden Field**. Wolsey became Cardinal and Lord Chancellor in 1515, and Papal Legate in 1518. By 1525 Henry had decided to throw his influence with France against Spain and the Emperor Charles V. In 1527 the question of the marriage with Queen Catherine was raised. **Wolsey fell in 1529**, and in that year began to sit the "Seven Years' Parliament," which effected the final breach with Rome. Under penalties of *Præmunire* **the clergy were forced in 1531 to accept Henry's church policy**. An act stopping all appeals to Rome was passed in 1533, and Cranmer in that year pronounced Henry's marriage with Catherine void and that with Anne Boleyn legal. In **1534 Parliament abolished the authority of the Pope in England**, and in **1535 the Act of Supremacy gave Henry the title of Supreme Head on earth of the Church of England**. In 1535 Fisher and More went to the block, and Thomas Cromwell was made Vicar-General. **Henry dissolved the lesser monasteries in 1536**, and in that and the next year occurred the insurrections known as the "**Pilgrimage of Grace**." **The remaining monasteries were dissolved in 1539**, and in the same year the **Act of the Six Articles** enforced with severe penalties the acceptance of the chief Roman Catholic doctrines. Cromwell was executed in 1540. Henry VIII died in 1547. The Protector Somerset defeated the Scots at Pinkie in 1547 in a vain attempt to force a marriage between Edward VI and Mary Queen of Scots. **The first Prayer-Book of Edward VI was established in 1549** by an Act of Uniformity that made Protestant worship compulsory. The Protector Somerset was executed in **1552**, and in that year the second act of Uniformity enforced the more Protestant **Second Prayer-Book of Edward VI**. Edward's death in 1552 was followed in 1553 by **Mary's Act of Parliament annulling all the laws concerning religion made in his reign**, and active persecution of Protestants soon began. Mary lost Calais in 1558, and her

death in the same year brought the restoration of Protestantism. **In 1559 an Act of Supremacy made the breach with Rome permanent, and an Act of Uniformity re-enforced, with slight changes, the Prayer-Book of Edward VI.** Elizabeth began severe treatment of the Roman Catholics in 1562, and the **Thirty-nine Articles of 1563** made Protestant doctrine as well as worship compulsory for the clergy. Mary Queen of Scots took refuge in England in 1568. Insurrection in her favour broke out in 1569, and **in 1570 the Pope Pius V issued a bull releasing England from allegiance to Elizabeth.** Active persecution of Roman Catholics followed. **In 1577 Drake began his voyage round the world.** Whitgift, Archbishop of Canterbury, began the severe repression of the Puritans in 1583 with the aid of the High Commission Court. In 1585 Elizabeth openly aided the Dutch revolt against Philip II. A new conspiracy to put Mary on the throne was discovered in 1586, **Mary was executed in 1587, and the Spanish Armada was defeated in 1588.** Elizabeth's favourite, Leicester, died in 1588, Walsingham in 1590, and Burghley in 1598. Essex's insurrection and execution took place in 1601, and the queen died in 1603.

BOOKS FOR REFERENCE

* Froude, *History of England* (especially for Elizabeth's reign) (12 vols., 1893); * Friedmann, *Anne Boleyn* (2 vols., 1884); Dixon, *History of the Church of England* (especially for the dissolution of monasteries) (6 vols., 1884-1901); Gasquet, *Henry VIII and the English Monasteries* (1893); Seebohm, *Oxford Reformers* (1887); * Innes, *Cranmer and the Reformation in England* (1900); Pollard, *England under the Protector Somerset* (1902); * Creighton, *Queen Elizabeth* (1899); Creighton, *The Age of Elizabeth* (1888); Corbett, *Drake and the Tudor Navy* (2 vols., 1898); * Jessopp, *the Great Pillage* (desolation of the parish churches under Edward VI) (1901).

324
CHAPTER
XIII
1 1 1

CHAPTER XIII

The England of Elizabeth

ENGLAND was more orderly under the Tudors than in any previous age, and to check the lawless elements in the land both Henry VIII and Elizabeth, like Henry VII, made great use of the Court of the Star Chamber. It often acted tyrannically; it punished juries for verdicts displeasing to the Government, imposed heavy and unjust fines, put men in the pillory, whipped them, or cut off their hands and ears; but its work showed that the Government was strong, and that the riotous scenes of the fifteenth century were not to be repeated. Henry VIII gave new boroughs representation in Parliament at his discretion, and had always an obedient majority. So, on the whole, had Elizabeth. There was no one to dispute the sovereign's authority, but the work of government was carried on with a steadily diminished shedding of blood. Henry VIII took human life almost at will; under Elizabeth only those guilty of real crimes against the state went to the block.

The intellectual changes of the time began with what is called the New Learning, a breaking away of men's minds from the study of theology alone to a varied range of human interests hitherto neglected. About the beginning of the sixteenth century, first Oxford, and then Cambridge, took up the study of Greek with enthusiasm, and the knowledge of the Greek New Testament helped men to think more independently about religion. For this very reason Greek


The New
Learning.

was feared by the old orthodoxy, much as in modern times science has been feared; but this did not prevent a passionate devotion to classical art and literature. Queen Elizabeth startled Oxford by a speech in Greek; Roger Ascham, paying a chance visit to Lady Jane Grey, found her reading with delight a dialogue of Plato in the original Greek, and many of both sexes shared her tastes. Scholars, like Erasmus, scorned to use any but an ancient tongue. Yet the chief intellectual interest of the Tudor

The great out-
burst of English
Literature.
Shakespeare, etc.

period is not in this revival of antiquity, but in a marvellous outburst of genius in English literature. Sir Philip Sidney, the author of *The Arcadia*, and Edmund Spenser, author of *The Faerie Queene*, were older contemporaries of a mightier genius. Shakespeare is one of the world's master minds. He found in English a tongue fit to express his highest thoughts, and made it a classic language, to rank henceforth with the best: it completed England's equipment for a full and rich national life. Marlowe and Ben Jonson wrote plays only inferior to Shakespeare's, and the age was great enough to understand and appreciate its best minds. The dramatists pleased the court and the town. For the religious world Hooker wrote in

majestic English prose his *Ecclesiastical Polity* in defence of the Church of England as Elizabeth finally settled it. Francis Bacon, the first to see the importance of the modern methods of experiment and observation in the study of nature, was famous before the queen died. It is a splendid galaxy of names which gives England hence-



WILLIAM SHAKESPEARE
(1564-1616).

forth a high place in the intellectual world. The modern era has never surpassed those who stand pre-eminent at its beginning.

The leaders of the time were many-sided. Sir Philip Sidney was not only a poet, but a soldier and a religious enthusiast: he died in Holland fighting for the Protestant cause, saying, on his last day,

English mercantile enterprise.

"I would not change my joy for the empire of the world"; he planned also to rival in the New World the exploits of Drake. The chivalry of such men was not less daring than the earlier chivalry of the crusaders, and it was deeper, stronger, and more human. Protestant fervour linked itself with the love of adventure and the desire to grow rich. Frobisher and Davis tried to find a passage at the north of America, by which England might the more easily trade with Asia. Sir Hugh Willoughby and Sir Richard Chancellor had before them tried to reach Asia by sailing round the north of Norway and Russia. Willoughby perished in the Arctic Sea, but Chancellor landed somewhere near the modern Archangel, made his way to Moscow, was surprised to find it a city not unlike London, and in effect discovered Russia for English trade. English merchants traded in the Mediterranean, and went to Turkey and lands farther east. They sailed into the southern seas, ready either to trade or to fight the hated Spaniard; Sir Richard Grenville, in *The Revenge*, met in 1591 a superior Spanish force off the Azores, and died with the splendid courage described in Tennyson's famous ballad. Englishmen finally sailed round the Cape of Good Hope, but there the Dutch had preceded them, and already powerful Dutch companies were trading in India when in 1600 Elizabeth gave a charter to the East India Company, which was destined to play so great a part in English commerce and empire.

When this spirit of adventure was once aroused, England could never again be the same island state. Colo-

nizing effort failed, it is true, for the time. Sir Walter Raleigh tried without success to found a settlement in what we know as Virginia. Though the ships of Spain alone were four times as numerous as those of England in Newfoundland, Sir Humphrey Gilbert raised there the English flag in 1583. But not until long after Elizabeth's time was the English claim finally secure, and this shadowy colony was all that she ruled beyond the two islands. Yet in trade, if not in territory, England saw a vast expansion, which involved complete reorganization. The old guilds abused their powers, and by narrow restrictions had forced trade to leave the towns for villages where the guilds had no control. At last under Edward VI the guilds were finally destroyed, and, though it was long before monopolies died, there was then a steady growth towards freer competition. Capital was embarking in trade, and 10 per cent, a reasonable rate for the time, was allowed by law for interest on money. Great trading companies grew up—the Russian Company, the Levant Company for trade with Turkey, the Guinea Company for African trade, and, finally, in 1600, the East India Company itself. Each company enjoyed a monopoly of its own branch of trade.

English commercial development was aided by religious persecution on the Continent. Refugees from the Low Countries and from France carried to England the arts of lace-making and silk-weaving, and also improvements in cloth manufacture.

Parliament gave special customs favours to goods imported in English vessels, and to encourage the fishing industry, a fish diet on fast-days was made of civil, though no longer of religious, obligation. To preserve the superiority of English wool the export of living sheep was still prohibited. London became perhaps the most important commercial centre in the world, displacing Antwerp, half

ruined by the Duke of Alva; already London had more than 125,000 inhabitants, and the fact alarmed the Government, which in vain forbade the further extension of the city.

A few of the old nobility who survived, if they were not ruined by the extravagance of court life, still kept up baronial state, robbed, however, of all military menace. Attention to agriculture. An earl or an archbishop would have in his house many dependents, among them often gentlemen, who lived on their patron's bounty, and were at leisure to cultivate literature or art. Agriculture improved, for at least the smaller gentry paid personal attention to their estates. There was now a greater variety in garden products, and in consequence better food for both man and beast. The landholding classes were again growing rich, and rank depended upon income rather than upon birth; the baron of the earlier age had farmed only to support his numerous retainers, the landholder of Elizabeth's time farmed to make money. Wool was the chief source of wealth, but by the middle of Elizabeth's reign beef and wheat were profitable. Yet the lot of the labourer did not improve. The old patriarchal relations were gone, and the labourers now worked for a money wage; but, owing to the quantities of precious metals brought from America, the purchasing power of gold and silver coins declined, while the rate of wages did not greatly increase. The proper care of the poor had indeed become already a burning question for legislators. Mediæval England had solved it, as it is in part solved in America now, by voluntary charity. But the breakdown of the manorial system, the desolation of the monasteries and of the guilds, which had helped the poor, and the debasement of the coinage through which a shilling came to be worth little more than half its former value, all combined to make the claims of the poor urgent. In 1536, the very year when the destruction of the mon-

asteries began, Henry VIII passed an act for helping the disabled poor, but it was not until the end of Elizabeth's reign, in 1601, that a Poor Law was enacted giving two or three overseers in each parish power to tax the inhabitants to provide for the poor. From that time Poor Laws have been important in English social life.

In Tudor England art secured no great triumphs. Holbein, a famous painter, was in Henry VIII's service, but he was a foreigner. An English school of painting did not develop until Elizabeth's time, and it does not rank high in the history of art. Gothic architecture reached its last phase and glory under Henry VII in the Perpendicular style,

The Poor Law
of 1601.

Art,
architecture,
furniture, etc.




EMMANUEL COLLEGE, CAMBRIDGE, RENAISSANCE STYLE.

Built in the reign of Elizabeth.

and there was nothing creative in the changes of the Tudor age; England followed the Continent in what is known as the Renaissance style—a revival of the columns, arches,


entablatures, and ornaments of classic days. Few churches were built, as already there were more than Protestantism required ; but the new landholders built great mansions, ranged round court-yards like the earlier castle, though with no thought of defence. The wide windows, filled with glass, looked out upon the open country, and there were no fortified approaches. The standard of living had



FITZWILLIAM MUSEUM, CAMBRIDGE.

Built in the nineteenth century, and showing the revived classical style in its perfection.

greatly improved ; even the smaller houses had chimneys, carpets were common, and beautiful tapestry was much used. Chairs and stools were sometimes padded for greater comfort, and in the huge beds, hung also with tapestry, pillows had displaced the former log of wood. Often rooms were decorated with flowers or green boughs, and sweet-smelling herbs were strewn on the floors.



HADDON HALL (BUILT BETWEEN 1150 AND 1600).

The building represents the changing ideals for a dwelling between the twelfth and the sixteenth centuries. It was altered by successive owners to meet the requirements of the times. Note the high, small windows of the earlier building compared with the larger windows, looking out upon a beautiful terraced garden, both added by Dorothy Vernon and her husband in the time of Elizabeth. Haddon Hall has not been found a suitable modern dwelling-place, and, though preserved intact, has been unoccupied for a hundred and fifty years.

The roads were still so bad that carriages were almost unknown; a team of six horses was sometimes used for even a two-wheeled cart, but towards the end of the reign the pavements in London improved, and some carriages were to be seen in the streets. In society there was little of refinement in our modern sense. Elizabeth spat upon a courtier whose attire did not please her; she boxed another's ears, and she tickled the back of the Earl of Leicester when he knelt before her to receive his earldom. From the queen down through the upper classes swearing was fashionable and

Manners and
morals.



PORTION OF HADDON HALL,

Showing in greater detail a part of the Elizabethan façade and of the terraced garden.

looked upon as a mark of breeding, but those of lower rank who swore were fined. Immorality was certainly more open and shameless then than now. There were gross scenes in the London streets, and from unbridled

profligacy some of the finest spirits of the time sank, we know, to early graves. As much could, no doubt, be said of portions of modern English society, but under Elizabeth ethical standards were not high, and this may account for some of the narrowness and rigidity of the Puritans, who, like the early Christians, found themselves in revolt against a surrounding world, which paid little heed to Christian morals.



SIR CHRISTOPHER HATTON (1540-1591).

An intimate of Elizabeth's. Note the slashed coat and elaborate frill round the neck.

A writer of the time calls it an age of sham. There was an ill-regulated taste for splendour such as Henry VIII showed on "The Field of the Cloth of Gold." Wolsey kept eight hundred servants in York House, and was surrounded by a pompous array whenever he went out.

Dress. To appear the better figures, men padded their stockings to show good calves, wore thick cork soles to seem taller, and adorned themselves with bracelets and ear-rings. Extravagance in dress showed great extremes. A single pair of the short breeches known as trunk hose cost £100. Coats were often slashed and of brilliant colours. Men wore great plumes of feathers of divers colours in their hats. The women followed the vain and, in respect to dress, extravagant Elizabeth to ridiculous lengths; they wore vast frizzled and sometimes horned erections on their heads, and the huge ruffs round their necks rose at the back sometimes as high as this head-dress. Absurd hoops, surrounding the waist with a

wire structure that might almost be used as a table, were worn for a time, but the usual fashion of Elizabeth's time among both men and women favoured long waists in imitation of the queen's figure. "A ship was sooner rigged than a woman" was a contemporary satire.

There were usually but two meals a day—dinner at about eleven and supper at five; whatever was taken early in the morning did not yet rank as a meal. Food, etc.

Meat, including fowl and game, was cheap; bread, our other staple besides meat, was little used, vegetables like beans and peas taking its place. The potato and tea and coffee were not yet familiar to Europe. Wood-



SOLDIER WITH CALIVER (A WEAPON SIMILAR TO THE MUSKET), TIME OF ELIZABETH.


Note the curved stock and the huge trigger, pulled by the whole hand.

en trenchers and wooden spoons were now superseded by pewter and sometimes by silver, and there was much glass. Forks were in common use, but only at the very end of Elizabeth's reign. Soap was still scarce. Tobacco was already used by many, notwithstanding blasts against it like those of Elizabeth's successor, James I. Owing, no doubt, to their uncleanly way of living, plague still carried off large numbers of the poorer population of the towns. Sea voyages were peculiarly fatal to human life; it was estimated that within twenty years ten thousand men perished in English ships from scurvy. The absence of a vegetable diet was perhaps one chief cause of this mortality.

A favourite Sunday pastime was the baiting of bulls and bears with dogs. The queen hunted three or four days a week down almost to the very end of her reign. Playing-cards, familiar since 1463, had become a necessity

of fashionable life. Archery was still to be seen on village greens, though the age saw the final displacement of the bow as a military weapon by the smaller
Amusements. fire-arms. The tilts and tournaments had died out, but gentlemen still wore armour as a protection in hand-to-hand fighting and from the bullets of the musket.

(Aspects of the social life of the time are dealt with in the works noted in the previous chapters. See also Chapters VIII and XI and the works referred to in Traill: Social England, vol. iii.)



PIKEMAN, TIME OF ELIZABETH.

The long-handled pike with a sharp metal point had displaced the former spear. The musket was the *offensive*, the pike the *defensive* weapon, until a later time when the bayonet was added to the musket and made the pike unnecessary.

CHAPTER XIV

The Stuart Monarchy to the Execution of Charles I.

(1603-1649—46 years:

James I born 1566; succeeded in Scotland 1567;


“ “ England 1603; died 1625.

Charles I " 1600; " 1625; " 1649.

[The age is one of varied movements, but the dominant note is that of religious strife. The terrible Thirty Years' War between the Roman Catholic and Protestant parties in Germany lasted from 1618 to 1648, and was a disturbing factor in English foreign relations. In France, after the assassination of Henry IV in 1610, Cardinal Richelieu gained supreme power, and, Cardinal as he was, supported the German Protestants against Catholic Austria, while he crushed the Protestant party at home. He died in 1642 just when civil war broke out in England, and it was Cardinal Mazarin who directed French policy during that contest. The unrest in Europe did not check trade and colonial expansion. Holland led and England followed in commercial enterprises in India. The north of Ireland was colonized by English and Scots in the early days of James I. In

¹THE HOUSE OF STUART

HENRY VII = Elizabeth of York.



1607 the English founded Virginia, their first successful colony in America, and the great colonization movement to New England began in 1620. In the world of thought the ferment of the age produced great results. The Italian Galileo (died 1642), who taught that the earth moves round the sun; the German Kepler (died 1630), who discovered the laws governing the movements of the planets; the English Harvey (died 1657), who discovered the circulation of the blood—all did their best work in this period, which is adorned also by the great philosopher Descartes (died 1650), and by such painters as Rubens (died 1640), Van Dyck (died 1641), and Velasquez (died 1660). An age which in England had Shakespeare and Bacon at its beginning, and Milton at its end, must take a high place in the history of literature.]

WHEN the King of Scotland inherited the crown of England the two nations were permanently linked together for better or worse. In early Scotland four races had struggled for supremacy. In the north were the Picts, the ancestors of the Gaelic Highlander of the present day; south of them, on the west coast, were the Scots, immigrants from the land we now know as Ireland; farther south were the Britons, kindred in blood to the Welsh, but separated from them by a wedge of English invaders; and on the east coast the English themselves penetrated far north of the Tweed. At Carham, in 1018, the English invaders of Scotland had fought a strenuous battle to gain the north, but Malcolm II defeated them, drove them out of Lothian, and made the Tweed his southern boundary; since that time it has marked the border-line between Scotland and England. Edward I of England had tried to make Scotland a vassal state, but Bruce's victory over Edward's son at Bannockburn, in 1314, marked the climax of English failure. Yet none the less was Scotland under English influence; the great Scottish landholders were of Norman-English origin; trade was mainly in English hands, and the royal line itself was of English descent. The course of Scottish history in the fourteenth and fif-

The early
relations of
Scotland and
England.

teenth centuries was very like that of England. A quarter of a century after Edward I's establishment of the English Parliament, a Scottish Parliament also met; the Black Death desolated Scotland, too, and there the Lollard heresy gained a footing. In the fifteenth century, on the other hand, Scotland was perhaps less disturbed than England.

The Stuart kings, descended on the female side from Robert Bruce, began to reign in 1371, and from 1424 to 1542 Scotland had a succession of five Jameses. There was much lawless violence, and but one of these sovereigns died a natural death. They all aided France against England. Henry VII married his daughter Margaret to James IV of Scotland, with a view to the union of the two crowns; but when Henry VIII demanded that Scotland should break with France, his brother-in-law, James IV, attacked him in the spirit of a knight-errant, and perished with the greater part of the Scottish nobility on the fatal field of Flodden. The next three sovereigns of Scotland succeeded to the throne in infancy. James V (1513) was but a year old; Mary Queen of Scots (1542), his successor, but a few days old, and her successor, James VI (1567), was also only a year old on inheriting the crown. Yet, even with infant sovereigns, the influence of the monarch grew steadily stronger in the sixteenth century, chiefly, perhaps, because the old nobility, who alone could check it, had perished at Flodden. The Protestant movement of course affected Scotland, and from 1528, when Patrick Hamilton, a youth of noble blood and of great courage, was burned for heresy, the Protestant party, though weak at first, is visible.

It is to the reign of Mary Queen of Scots that posterity turns with the keenest interest. The infant queen had succeeded to a troubled heritage, and the strength of religious and political passion was apparent in 1542, when a band of zealots seized the castle of St. Andrews,

The Stuart
monarchy in
Scotland.

killed Cardinal Beaton, one of the Catholic leaders, and hung his lifeless body from the walls. John Knox, though

Religious
troubles under
Mary Queen
of Scots.

he was already prominent and approved of the killing of Beaton, had no direct part in this tragedy. The terrible fight between the two creeds was raging bitterly in 1559 when

Elizabeth identified England with Protestantism. The Scottish Protestant party turned to her for help, and in 1560 she brought about the Treaty of Edinburgh, under which the Scottish Estates or Parliament were to determine the religious question. Their meeting at Edinburgh in August, 1560, is the most momentous gathering in Scottish history. The Protestant majority proved overwhelming. Knox and other Protestant ministers drew up, at the request of the Estates, a confession of faith, which was eagerly adopted, and in a single day there were passed three acts abolishing the jurisdiction of the Pope and the celebration of the mass in Scotland. To the conclu-



JOHN KNOX (1505-1572).

sion thus reached Scotland has ever since held firmly. We think of Scottish Presbyterianism as rugged and stern in type, yet its origin is stained with less bloodshed than is the change to Protestantism in the great states of Europe. The Roman Church had burned few heretics in Scotland, and though the later strife was bitter enough, the Presbyterian party in its triumph executed not a single person on religious grounds.

Mary Stuart tried to undo Knox's work on her return to Scotland from France in 1561, but the Protestants finally won when in 1567 she was overthrown and forced to fly to England. The young James, Mary's son, was reared a Protestant, and the regent Murray, who ruled in

his name, was a strong man of deep Protestant convictions and English sympathies. Though Murray was murdered in 1570, and John Knox, his fellow-leader, died in 1572, the victory of Protestantism was secure. The majority of the Scottish people disliked even episcopacy, and in 1581 the Assembly of the Scottish Church, which had met regularly after 1560, condemned the office of bishop, and ordered those who held it to give it up. But though the party opposed to the bishops was able to take away their chief revenues and authority, bishops still continued to have a place in the Scottish Church. The Assembly was so strong in asserting the independence of the Church that it aroused the dislike of the young King James to its proceedings. He pitted the Scottish Parliament against the Scottish Assembly, and in 1584 the Parliament made him a practically absolute ruler. He was to be head of the Church; the Assembly might not meet without his sanction; and bishops were still to rule at least in name; until 1689—that is, for more than one hundred years—the struggle of the Scottish kings to force bishops upon Scotland continued, to end, however, only in defeat.

It was after these experiences in Scotland that James succeeded to Elizabeth's throne. He spoke with a strong Scottish accent, and his loud voice, sprawling gait, slovenly dress, gluttonous manners, and want of dignity, did not impress favourably the more critical of his new subjects. He was a really learned scholar, and, like his predecessors, Alfred and Henry VIII, an author; it is indeed remarkable that he wrote so much, for he was impatient of mental labour, excusing his real indolence on the ground that he could grasp in an hour what others acquired by much longer effort. He drank wine freely, used coarse language, and, though himself not undevout, encouraged a certain moral looseness that caused scandals; on one occasion ladies of

Scotland
under James.

The position
and character
of James I.

the court were too drunk to act their parts in a play before him and his brother-in-law, the King of Denmark. In many ways James was far-sighted. He pressed seriously the project for political union between England and Scotland, and only the jealousy of the English, lest Scots under a Scottish king should get all the good places, postponed a plan carried out a hundred years later. He saw, too, that religious strife could be appeased only by mutual tolerance, and was again in advance of his time. But he was quite ineffective in politics. Though he could write and talk he could not act with real decision. His talk did much mischief. He had come from a country where the notions of monarchy were influenced by the absolutism of France, and in England he boasted of his prerogative more than Elizabeth would have done. The English were not used to hearing that to question the king's will is like the atheism and blasphemy which dispute God's decrees. James never won the hearts of his English subjects, nor did he understand the deep differences between England and Scotland, and the crown and nation drifted apart under him beyond anything dreamed of under the equally despotic Tudors.

The Puritans hoped much from a king reared amid Presbyterian surroundings, while the Roman Catholics who had recently seen Henry IV of France abjure Protestantism, believed that the son of the martyred Mary Stuart would return to the ancient Church. With systematic duplicity James had encouraged both parties, but they



JAMES I.

soon had their awakening. The Puritans brought him a petition said to express the views of a thousand discontented clergy (the Millenary Petition). Though willing to retain the surplice as a permissible vestment, they demanded that the sign of the cross in baptism, and the terms "priest" and "absolution" should no longer be used. They desired also simpler music in the services, a stricter observance of Sunday, more and better preaching; and similar practical reforms. Some of these changes were needed, but the Puritans stood with equal insistence upon trifles; the Church, on the other hand, would not make the smallest concession; Baneroft, soon to be Archbishop of Canterbury, even objected to the Puritan proposition for a better translation of the Bible, and was sharply rebuked by the king. James arranged a conference between the opposing parties at the palace of Hampton Court. He was in his element as the arbiter in a theological discussion. The speakers fell on their knees when they pleaded their cause before him, and it was he who spoke the final word. At one point Reynolds, the leader of the Puritans, made use of the word presbyter. To James it called up many humiliations in past years from the rugged Presbyterians of Scotland. He broke into angry and scornful denunciations of Presbyterianism, and declared his policy to be "No bishop, no king." In doctrine the two parties differed little; the real quarrel was about external ceremonial and practical reforms, and the petulance of the king at Hampton Court destroyed the last chance of reconciliation. The Church party used its triumph without mercy. Convocation drew up in 1604 new canons defining minutely the Church's requirements. The beneficed clergy were forced to obey rules stricter even than Elizabeth's, and, in addition to this conformity, curates and lecturers were required to take an oath that they believed nothing in the Prayer-Book to be contrary to the word of

The Hampton
Court Con-
ference, 1604.

God. Rather than yield, about three hundred clergy gave up their places.

Another religious party still dreamed of supremacy in England. By this time the Church of Rome had recovered some of her losses in the days of Luther, and hoped to regain even England. Elizabeth's pressure upon the Roman Catholics had been terrible. The wealthier were forced to pay £20 a month for non-attendance at Anglican services, while the poorer "recusants" who absented themselves forfeited two-thirds of their land so long as they did not conform. To say mass, to attend mass even, was, as treason, still punishable with death. From time to time Roman Catholics were arrested on mere suspicion and long detained, and they rarely dared to complain of their treatment, since most, if not all, of them had attended mass and were liable to severe penalties. For a few months James adopted toward them a milder policy, but he soon found that whenever their situation became easier the numbers tended to increase, for then weak brethren dared openly to acknowledge their faith. Within nine months after Elizabeth's death one hundred and forty priests landed in England, and this alarmed the king. He had, moreover, a strong reason for resuming the old oppressions; he needed money, and the fines of Roman Catholics added appreciably to his revenues. So in February, 1604, he again ordered the banishment of the priests; in July Parliament passed a new Recusancy Act, reviving all the old penalties against Roman Catholics, and early in 1605 nearly six thousand persons were convicted of recusancy, and variously punished. But the spirit of the age was already milder than that of the Tudors, for the Lord Chancellor warned the judges who dealt with recusants to shed no blood.

Profound were the rage and disappointment of the Catholic party, and among them was a leader ready for any daring scheme. Robert Catesby, a man of great

bodily strength and beauty, and of winning manners, belonged to an old and wealthy Roman Catholic family.

The Gunpowder
Plot, 1605.

Under Elizabeth his father had paid to the Government one-fifth of his income for recusancy, and had, besides, spent years in prison. The son inherited his property while still young. At twenty-eight he joined in Essex's outbreak, and had to pay



THE GUNPOWDER PLOTTERS.

Catesby is the second and Fawkes the third from the right.

a fine equal to about £30,000 in money of the present day. He brooded over his wrongs, and at last in a mad spirit of fanaticism conceived the plan of destroying the king and Parliament of England by blowing them up with gunpowder. The scheme was wild and reckless. To destroy the king and Parliament would have little effect in establishing Roman Catholicism, and the conspirators acted without the consent or approval of the better elements in the Roman Catholic party. Catesby associated himself with Guy Fawkes, a convert to Roman Catholicism of unflinching courage and determination, and these two resolute men gathered about them weaker ones. Two or

three gentlemen of means like Francis Tresham and Sir Evelyn Digby were mixed up in the plot, and were to rally the gentlemen of their neighbourhoods when the king was killed. Preparations went on for quite a year. The conspirators packed with gunpowder a cellar under the House of Lords, and laid iron bars upon the barrels to make the expected explosion more destructive. Parliament was to open on November 5, 1605, and as the time drew near some of the plotters grew anxious to save friends of their own faith in attendance upon the king, for Roman Catholics were not yet excluded from Parliament. Lord Monteagle was warned to stay away. The Government was well-informed, but kept quiet until the last moment. When the blow fell, Fawkes was found in the cellar among the barrels of gunpowder. Catesby and his companions took horse and rode into the country, but at Holbeach, about a hundred miles from London, they were surrounded. Catesby was killed, fighting to the last.

Fawkes, when tortured, told all, and most of the conspirators perished upon the scaffold. The Gunpowder Plot affected the English nation profoundly. Though the Roman Catholics as a party were not responsible for it, none the less the punishment fell upon them. Henceforth in the popular mind they were

capable of any crime, and Parliament enacted against them even severer laws; they were forbidden to appear at



THE VAULT BENEATH THE HOUSE OF LORDS
ASSOCIATED WITH THE GUNPOWDER PLOT.

court, to travel more than five miles from home, to engage in trade, or in the legal or medical professions; and their houses were always to be open to official inspection. Until the nineteenth century they suffered disabilities without any hope of redress.

James was always dogged by financial distress. Elizabeth had spent about £300,000 a year upon army, navy, and the whole work of government. The national revenues were absurdly small; but

James's need
of money.

James, coming from Scotland, a very poor country, thought himself rich in England. In one month he gave £34,000 to six favourites, four of them Scots; in the second year of his reign he piled up debts amounting to nearly £800,000, or about two whole years' revenue. His reckless extravagance involved the use of every possible means to get money. Since the fourteenth century English kings, in deference to the protests of Parliament, had but rarely used their old right of levying on their own authority, without consulting the nation, the import duties known as tonnage and poundage. But Mary and Elizabeth resorted to it, and so now did James. His right to exact a duty on currants was disputed in 1606 by one Bate, backed by the House of Commons. The courts decided in favour of the king's prerogative, and until 1641 it was so exercised. In addition, James had the right to certain feudal dues, and to purveyance—an ancient custom by which the king's officers could impress the farmers' carts to carry the king's baggage whenever he travelled, and could force owners to sell goods to the king substantially at his own price; the custom was handed down from the old days when the court was more or less itinerant. The nation chafed under claims that in corrupt hands were made oppressive, and tried, in vain, to get James to abandon them for a money payment. He made £90,000 by selling the new hereditary title of baronet to well-to-do landholders. He sold some peerages

for £10,000 each. He sold high offices; Montague paid £20,000 to become Lord High Treasurer, and the money went to James's favourite, Buckingham. He levied occasional benevolences. But withal he was ever hard pressed. When ministers like Cecil, Earl of Salisbury, the younger son of Elizabeth's Burghley, and Cranfield, who became Earl of Middlesex, began to bring something like order into the finances, James would invariably multiply difficulties by new and unwise expenditure. His favourites cost him huge sums. Carr, afterward Earl of Somerset, a Scot, of whom the English courtiers were very jealous, was chief favourite until 1615.

Then he and his wife were convicted for their share in the murder of Sir Thomas Overbury, and James, who at least had a conscience, refused to see him again. George Villiers, who reached the high dignity of Duke of Buckingham, succeeded Somerset. "Christ had his John, and I have my George," James said fondly; and to the end Buckingham, though still a young man, ruled the king. He



GEORGE VILLIERS, DUKE OF
BUCKINGHAM (1592-1628).

overthrew Middlesex, the watch-dog of the treasury, led England into war with Spain, and added seriously to the financial distress.

Even under Elizabeth Parliament had begun to grow restive, and it entered upon an active struggle with James.

During the reign but four Parliaments were elected; the second came to an open rupture with the king, and its successor was only summoned after the lapse of seven years. James had no understanding of the nature and history of English institutions. He claimed that he alone must decide who might and who

James's
disputes with
Parliament.

might not sit in the House of Commons, and that Parliament could debate only those matters of public policy deputed to it by him. But with all his blustering talk he was a weak man; the Parliament soon understood this, and increased steadily in strength until by the end of the reign it passed quite beyond his control. James used the old royal privilege of granting trading monopolies. He took the right to manufacture glass from those who already possessed it, gave it to a company with influence at court, and forbade entirely the importation of foreign glass. The licensing of inns, to-day the source of enormous revenue, and the manufacture of gold and silver thread, were other monopolies. In 1621 the Commons condemned the whole system and assailed in a high-handed manner some of the king's servants profiting by it. Sir Giles Mompesson was the special object of their attack, and his methods reveal the evils of the practice of monopoly. Among other privileges Mompesson had power, on condition of paying a part of the spoils into the royal treasury, to license inns at whatever charges he chose to make. It was proved that he had granted licenses to many inns which the local authorities desired to close as disorderly houses, and that, on the other hand, he had levied fines upon thousands of innkeepers guilty of no real offence against the state. He was a member of Parliament, and Parliament dealt with him summarily, condemning him to be conducted along the Strand with his head to his horse's tail, to be heavily fined, to be imprisoned for life, and to be forever held an infamous person. The king was still able partly to shield Mompesson, but Parliament in the end forced James to agree to abolish all monopolies except those protecting new inventions—the modern patent rights. Bacon, the Lord Chancellor, one of the greatest names in the history of English thought, was a steady supporter of the king's claims to authority, while Sir Edward Coke, Chief Justice of the Court of King's Bench, until he was arbi-

trarily dismissed in 1616, took the opposite view of the law throughout a great part of the reign. The House of Commons found at last an opening to attack Bacon. A judge's relations to suitors were then less restricted than they now are; the small judicial salaries were usually supplemented by fees, and when a case was concluded it was not unusual for the judge to receive a present from one or the other side. Bacon received in this manner large amounts, paid while the cases under consideration were pending, though it was hardly charged seriously that he had been influenced by these payments, for his judgments were adverse to at least some of those giving the bribes.



FRANCIS BACON,
BARON VERULAM (1561-1626).

In 1621 the matter came before the House of Commons, only too glad to attack the recent defender of monopolies. The House of Lords tried the case; conviction was certain, and, as Bacon himself admitted, it was also just. He was dismissed from office, imprisoned, and heavily fined. The king remitted a part of the punishment.

James was a sincere lover of peace. His daughter Elizabeth married in 1613 the Elector-Palatine, a German

Protestant prince, and he planned to marry his son Henry to a princess of the Spanish royal house, and thus to have influence with both the Roman Catholic and the Protestant parties, who were getting ready for the terrible Thirty Years' War. Henry, a promising young man, died in 1612, but a few years later his brother Charles, now heir to the throne, was substituted for him in the Spanish negotiations. As a condition of the marriage, Spain demanded permanent toleration for the Roman Catholics in England, a conces-

James's
foreign policy.

sion which James could not really guarantee. In hope of securing financial relief he allowed Sir Walter Raleigh,



SIR WALTER RALEIGH
(1552 ?-1618).

the last survivor of the Elizabethan assailants of Spain, who early in the reign was sentenced to death for conspiracy and had since been kept in prison, to send to the Orinoco to secure a gold-mine which had been heard of on earlier voyages to America. Raleigh's party found no mine, but, at a time when James least wished to offend Spain, they attacked a Spanish village and shed Spanish blood. The old sentence of death was enforced to please Spain, and on

the 29th of October, 1618, Raleigh's gray head fell on the block.

The sacrifice of Raleigh to Spain was ineffective. The marriage treaty was not completed; the bitter Thirty

Years' War which was so long to devastate War with Spain.

Germany broke out, and James's son-in-law, the Elector-Palatine, was soon overwhelmingly defeated. England tingled with sympathy for the Protestant cause, of which the Elector was the champion, but the dallying with Catholic Spain went on. In 1623 Charles and Buckingham went to Madrid to try to hasten the marriage; instead they killed it. The demand that England should give full religious liberty to the Roman Catholics; the doubts of the young princess about a Protestant husband, who, as her confessor said, was "certain to go to hell"; and the certainty that Spain would give no help to the Protestant Elector, wore out the young prince's patience. He and Buckingham returned, embittered against Spain, and determined to declare war. Parliament, which met

in 1624, was also eager to adopt this policy, and for once acted with Charles, against whom it was destined to engage in such deadly strife. Middlesex, the Lord Treasurer, who opposed war on the ground of economy, was impeached and disgraced; and James, the lover of peace, was forced into the background while his son became the real ruler. England sent twelve thousand troops to help the Elector, but they were badly equipped, they had not money even to purchase food, and France refused to allow them to cross her territory to the scene of the war; three-fourths of them perished in the Low Countries of cold and neglect. James bitterly lamented that evil counselors had dragged him into war against his will, and on March 27, 1625, he died, aged only fifty-six, but already an old man who had lost control both of Parliament and of his headstrong son.

It was in James's reign that England firmly planted her foot in America. In 1607 Virginia was founded, and in 1620 some English Independents who had led a troubled life in England and some who had escaped thence to Holland went out together in the *Mayflower*, to begin upon the iron shores of New England the most remarkable colony that the world has ever seen. In the world of letters the most striking monument of James's reign is the English translation of the Bible put forth in 1611. The king by whose authority this work was undertaken must with all his faults and weaknesses be regarded a benefactor of the English-speaking nations. It remains still the most treasured literary monument in their language.

All the Stuarts matured early; though Charles I was but twenty-five when he became king, his character was fully formed and changed little in later years. In contrast with the voluble and undignified James, Charles was

reserved, decorous, and sometimes stern; while James was easily approached, Charles, with a high sense of kingly majesty, revived the state of Elizabeth and was difficult of access. Like his father, he was untruthful, and in intellect and sympathies he was narrow. England had reached a point where almost miraculous wisdom, tact, and forbearance were necessary to reconcile the old order with the changes wrapped up in newly won liberties. But Charles's mind was closed to new ideas, and he could not understand the point of view of those opposing his plans, who to him

The character
of Charles I.



CHARLES I (1600-1649).

were always villains. A resolve once formed he never changed, and when really brought to bay he scorned to consult expediency. Undoubtedly he had many amiable personal qualities, for he proved a tender husband and a fond father. He shared creditably in the manly sports of the time, was an excellent judge of both music and painting, and had a mind well stored with ecclesiastical learning. His ultimate ruin was brought about

in part by the influence of his Bourbon wife, Henrietta Maria, a daughter of that Henry IV of France who had gained his crown by deserting the Protestant faith. When a fair compromise was possible in Charles's quarrel with Parliament she told him that he would be a poltroon and a coward to yield.

The real ruler of England during the first three years of Charles's reign was the Duke of Buckingham, who, though able, had made his way to high place by good looks and winning manners rather than by the patient industry of statesmanship. He had unbounded confidence in his

own powers and bore himself in foreign diplomacy as the equal of kings. Under James the Parliament had learned

The grounds
of Charles's
quarrel with
Parliament.

to distrust Buckingham, who would render no account for moneys voted, and

when Charles's first Parliament met in 1625 there was trouble at once. Before making new grants Parliament demanded an account of the sums last voted, and told the king bluntly that to Buckingham were due the troubles of the state. Undoubtedly Henry VIII and Elizabeth would have tolerated no interference by Parliament with their ministers;

Charles, also, treated the attack as one upon himself, and in August, 1625, summarily dismissed the Parliament.



HENRIETTA MARIA, QUEEN OF
CHARLES I (1609-1669).



SIR JOHN ELIOT (1592-1632).

Thus began at the outset of the reign the quarrel which brought Charles in the end to the scaffold. His conscience prompted him to preserve unimpaired the royal power as he inherited it, to levy duties as his predecessors had done, and to make no concession to the spirit of the age. In the House of Commons, on the other hand, were men like Sir John Eliot and John Pym, resolved to press to the utmost every claim to power

made by Parliament in the past, and especially in the days of the Lancastrian kings when it was supreme. These

leaders opposed the king not only on political but on religious grounds, for they suspected his Protestantism. There can be no doubt that Charles was sincerely attached to the Protestant religion, but his point of view was not that of the great majority of his subjects. Both his mother and his grandmother had been Roman Catholics; his wife was of that faith, and he did not share the horror of the Roman system which nearly a century of strife had created in the minds of the English Protestants. He liked dignified ritual, hated the Calvinism to which English Protestantism was devoted, and instead of the strict Puritan observance of the Sabbath favoured sports on a Sunday afternoon. The nation could not understand that one who differed from it on these points was really Protestant at heart.

Charles continued the war with Spain begun under James, and was always in urgent need of money. When Parliament failed him he levied customs and other duties on his own authority, demanded "free gifts" from the counties and forced loans from individuals, and took advantage of an old law, requiring seaports to provide for naval defence, to make London and other places pay "ship-money" to build a fleet. The money raised was not well spent. An expedition against Cadiz under Lord Wimbledon, a grandson of Burghley, turned out disastrously, and in February, 1626, with coffers empty Charles had to call his second Parliament. The opposition was stronger than ever. On May 8 the Commons sent to the Peers articles impeaching Buckingham; he was charged with maladministration, with the corrupt use of public funds, and, absurdly, even with poisoning his patron James I. The Commons were in deadly earnest, and on June 15 Charles angrily dissolved the House without securing any new revenue. The Court of Star Chamber dismissed the impeachment of Buckingham, and the duke went on his course in defiance

The attack on
Buckingham
and his death.

of Parliament. The Protestants, as a political body, were being crushed in France by Richelieu, and in 1627 he began the siege of the Huguenot stronghold of Rochelle. Charles attacked France in aid of the Huguenots and the nation approved, though Buckingham's leadership gave new grounds for fault-finding. He led an expedition to the siege of Rochelle in the summer of 1627, but it failed, and some thousands of the English perished miserably. In March, 1628, Charles had again to meet Parliament, now furnished with a new grievance, for he had imprisoned some of the members. A Petition of Right reasserting the ancient liberties of Englishmen to be free from arbitrary imprisonment, and also from taxes levied without consent of Parliament, was presented to the king by both Houses, and not until he consented to its terms would they grant the needed money. Meanwhile Buckingham fitted out a new expedition to relieve Rochelle. But his career came to a sudden end. On August 23 he was stabbed and instantly killed at Portsmouth by John Felton, an officer who had some grievance in regard to employment. To no one did Charles again give the power that Buckingham enjoyed. Parliament met in January, 1629, and the duke's death was found to make little difference in the attitude of either side. Though Charles had assented to the Petition of Right which admitted the control of Parliament over taxation, he still went on collecting tonnage and poundage, and the despotic Court of Star Chamber inflicted ruinous fines on those resisting payment. For his part, the king was quite sure that if Parliament would



CARDINAL RICHELIEU
(1585-1642).

not do his bidding he could rule without it, as Henry VIII and Elizabeth had done for long intervals; leaders like Eliot and Pym were, on the other hand, fighting for something more precious to them than life itself—for religious and political liberty. It was inevitable, perhaps, that the appeal should be at last to force. Convictions were too strong for compromise.

The Parliament was proceeding vigorously with its policy of refusing supplies and of discussing the needed redress of grievances when, on March 2, 1629,

Parliament dissolved in 1629, and did not meet again for eleven years.

Sir John Finch, the Speaker, told the Commons that the king ordered the members to separate without further debate on political or religious questions. This was a direct interference with the right of free speech in Parliament, and before Finch could declare the House adjourned some members angrily held him on his seat by force, locked the doors, and hastily passed resolutions, condemning innovations in religion and the levying and paying of tonnage and poundage not authorized by Parliament. Finch protested with tears that he would die for his country, but that he dared not, by remaining in the chair, sin against the express command of his sovereign, and the majesty of kingship was such that many others felt the same perplexity. It was a memorable scene, and those who led in it were soon to feel that the royal hand was heavy. Charles met defiance with defiance. He dissolved the House, and not for eleven years did Parliament meet again in England. He threw into prison the members who led in opposing him. Eliot, the boldest and most uncompromising of them, was still a prisoner in the Tower when he died, three years later. For eleven years Charles ruled England as despotically as any Tudor.

William Laud, Archbishop of Canterbury, shaped Charles's ecclesiastical policy. In disposition he was not unlike the king himself. Though blameless in character,

he had narrow sympathies and no tact. He was resolved to bring about religious uniformity in England, and to do it through the power of the state. At Land's policy.

every turn he violated Puritan prejudice. When in Scotland with James, in 1617, he had insisted upon wearing the surplice at a funeral, much to the scandal of the Presbyterians. His practice on entering a church was to bow to the east end, where, by his command, the communion table was now placed "altar-wise," and he bowed also at the name of Jesus—practices that caused great offence. On his advice, Charles reissued, in 1633, the "Book of Sports," put forth by James, inviting the people to devote Sunday afternoons to athletic games, dancing, and other amusements, and the clergy were ordered to read the declaration from their pulpits. A London clergyman obeyed, but followed the declaration with the Ten Commandments. "You have heard God's and man's commandments," he said ;

"obey which you please." Laud believed in the divine right of bishops as well as in that of kings, and disliked the vehemence of the Puritan preachers, their narrow Sabbatarianism, their Calvinistic doctrine, which taught that God had predestined some men to damnation, and their want of reverence for the traditions of the past. It was not the least of Puritan offences that they emphasized the rights of the laity, who, Laud thought, ought to obey and be silent.

Without doubt, most Englishmen, both lay and clerical, disliked Laud's views and policy. It seemed to them that



WILLIAM LAUD, ARCHBISHOP OF
CANTERBURY (1573-1645).

his aim was to restore the Roman system; even the Pope thought this, as was revealed by the offer to Laud in 1633 of a cardinal's hat. But Laud cared no more for Rome than for Geneva; he wished to restore the services of the Church to what he thought was the ancient model, and was persuaded that outward uniformity would in time bring with it inner unity too; it was a shallow view, but from it he never receded. Since Rome was no longer a formidable force in England, Laud's energies were concentrated against Puritanism, and his vigour was such that before 1630 a good many, with the life of Parliament suspended and the religious outlook uncertain, began to think of homes elsewhere. About one thousand, mainly of the well-to-do middle class, followed the Mayflower pilgrims of ten years earlier to America and founded the remarkable colony of Massachusetts Bay. Laud's hand was heavy on those opposing him. Dr. Alexander Leighton attacked the authority of bishops and kings in scurrilous terms; Laud's punishment was to cut off his ear, slit his nostril, and flog and imprison him, with the promise of more later. Prynne, a lawyer, attacked with bitter Puritan vehemence the frequenting of theatres and other doings of the court world; both his ears were cut off, and he was imprisoned at the king's pleasure. Laud visited the parishes within his jurisdiction, punishing immorality even in people of high rank, and enforcing uniformity of the narrowest kind. But to his surprise his policy had the unforeseen effect of alarming and arousing the nation. Few were moved when Prynne's ears were first cut off in 1634, but four years later, when what still remained of them was sheared off for a new offence, a great crowd showed its sympathy with the sufferer.

Charles's policy soon forced the champions of constitutional rights into alliance with the Puritans. When the tax of "ship-money" levied on the seaports to build a

The tyranny
of Laud.

navy was disputed, the judges held that, to insure the nation's safety, the king might raise money without the sanction of Parliament. Charles revived an old statute fining those with estates worth as much as £40 a year who had neglected or refused to receive knighthood upon the king's summons, and from this source alone he secured tens of thousands of pounds. He revived and sold monopolies and re-enforced old and vexatious forest laws. It was useless to appeal to the courts, for most of the judges held office at the king's pleasure, and were ready to do his will. The king's Privy Council usurped the functions of Parliament and legislated for the nation. Hardly a trace of self-government remained in England.

Of the men who stood by the king in this time of conflict the strongest was undoubtedly Sir Thomas Wentworth, who became ultimately Earl of Strafford. Wentworth was rich, and of ancient lineage, and his stately tastes regarded as merely vulgar the Puritanism which abhorred ritual. He desired good and strong government, and though at first a champion of the liberties of Parliament, he persuaded himself that Government by Parliament meant disunion and anarchy, and that only the authority of the king could give England what she needed. The death of Buckingham became Wentworth's opportunity. He rose rapidly, and was soon president of the Council of the North and practical ruler of nearly half of England. But he was needed elsewhere. Ireland



THOMAS WENTWORTH, EARL OF
STRAFFORD (1593-1641).

was drifting into anarchy, and in July, 1633, Charles sent him as Lord Deputy to rule that unhappy country.

Strafford in
Ireland.

In Ireland Wentworth ruled as a benevolent despot. He introduced order and discipline into the government, encouraged industry, forced the Irish Parliament to obey his slightest wish, and held all opposition in check by a large and well-paid army; writing to Laud, he spoke of this policy as "thorough." His despotism brought stable government in Ireland, and when trouble came in England he desired to apply there the same strong remedy. Pym and his friends read Wentworth's plan, and fought it with a tenacity that in the end carried its author to the block.

It was Scotland that first threw off the yoke of Charles and Laud. When only two years old Charles had left

The revolt
against Charles
in Scotland.

Scotland; he did not revisit it for thirty years, and had little understanding of its people. At last in 1633 he went to Scotland and took with him Laud. Many of the church structures were plain, square, and unsightly, and their galleries reminded Laud of the seats of a theatre; the long-winded prayers of the ministers offended the English taste, and the king returned home resolved to change the whole character of public worship in Scotland. Already in the first years of his reign Charles had, by one sweeping Act of Revocation, resumed possession of the Church and crown lands in Scotland alienated since his grandmother, Mary Stuart, became queen in 1542. It was an arbitrary and unjust measure, for some of the nobles had suddenly to give up possessions held by their families for nearly one hundred years, but the Church gained, for Charles's act restored property to her. He soon proceeded in the same way to reorganize the Church herself, and went about the task with characteristic want of tact. Laud assumed the tone of master to the Scottish ministers, and though in dealing with Scotland he acted not as Archbishop of Can-

terbury, but as Charles's secretary, it seemed to the Scots as if an English ecclesiastic were tampering with their Church, and national feeling was aroused against him. When vacancies occurred in Scotland Charles appointed bishops of Laud's type; he enlarged their authority, and showed a firm resolve to make Scotland, long accustomed to simple Presbyterian services, use, like England, a Book of Common Prayer. In 1636, without consulting the Assembly of the Church of Scotland, Charles issued new canons for its government, which ruthlessly violated Scottish prejudices. The ministers were rebuked for their long sermons; the communion table was to be placed "altar-wise" in the chancel; the people were to confess their sins to the bishop or presbyter; the authority of the bishops was to be supreme, and subject only to that of the king. In 1637 followed the new Prayer-Book. It was modelled upon that of the Church of England, and must be adopted forthwith by the parishes. Tumults broke out at once. In St. Giles, Edinburgh, there was a riot when the form of prayer was first used, on August 23, 1637. Some of those present began to shout that the mass was once more restored, and a female zealot, when an adjoining worshipper said "Amen" to one of the prayers, struck him in the face with her Bible, crying, "Traitor, dost thou say mass at my ear?" All Scotland was soon aflame, most of the bishops fled from the country, and by March, 1638, the Scots were freely signing a National Covenant to resist the king's innovations. The Scottish Church Assembly met at Glasgow in November; when commanded by the king's commissioner to dissolve it refused to obey, and proceeded to depose the bishops and to declare the new canons and Prayer-Book null and void. Such defiance meant war; Charles accepted the challenge, and at Berwick in the summer of 1639 his army stood face to face with the Scots in arms under Alexander Leslie. But as the king dared not summon the English Parliament to

ask for money, and without it could not keep his force in the field, he made terms. On June 18 he signed what is called the Treaty of Berwick, agreeing that the



JOHN HAMPDEN (1594-1643).

Assembly and the Estates or Parliament should meet to determine the religious question. They met at Edinburgh and declared for the abolition of episcopacy. Charles, as unchanged in his resolution as they, would not accept this decision; he adjourned the Parliament and prepared again for an appeal to arms.

The year 1639 marks the crisis of Charles's policy. Scotland was openly in revolt. In England his right to levy taxes was attacked anew in the law courts; John Hampden, a wealthy country gentleman, denied the legality of "ship-money," now, in Charles's financial distress, levied on inland places as well as on seaports. A bare majority of the judges decided in favour of the tax, but the situation was so serious that Charles

had need of his strongest friend by his side, and summoned Wentworth, now Earl of Strafford, from Ireland. Strafford believed that England was still loyal, and he advised the bold course of summoning the Parliament of England to give aid against Scotland. The Parliament, the first for eleven years, met in April, 1640, but sat for only three weeks. Charles explained that England was menaced with inva-

The summoning of the English Parliament.




JOHN PYM (1584-1643).

sion from Scotland, and that he must have money to repel it. He was plainly told, in reply, that his own policy was a worse menace than the Scots. John Pym, already a veteran in resisting arbitrary government, made a notable speech in the Commons, attacking, in a firm and moderate tone, Laud's innovations in ritual and the ship-money and other taxes. By a large majority, the Commons demanded redress of grievances before voting money, and Charles, rather than yield, promptly dissolved the Parliament, without getting help. But his difficulties were overwhelming. In Scotland the Presbyterians were everywhere triumphant, and they prepared to invade England. Charles, in turn, was resolved to yield nothing to Presbyterianism, and to subdue the Scots by force, and Strafford, who profoundly misread English feeling, still told him that whatever the House of Commons might say, the real opinion of England was with him against the Scots. In his desperate need Charles begged a loan from Spain, promising, in return, to help Spain against Protestant Holland. He sought money in France. Through his Catholic wife he even asked the Pope to lend him both money and men to subdue his rebellious Protestant subjects, and the Pope offered to do so if Charles would become a Catholic. But nothing came of it all, and he had to go on unaided.

The Scots invaded England in August, 1640, seized Newcastle, and were soon in possession of the counties of Durham and Northumberland, while in Scotland Charles lost the few strongholds that he had held. On every side he heard the demand that in so grave a crisis Parliament should be summoned. He resisted as long as he could. First he called the Peers together at York on September 24. They met and advised a truce with the Scots and the summoning of Parliament. Strafford was vehement against the Scots, and to avenge his helpless-

The meeting of
the Long
Parliament and
the execution
of Strafford.

ness in England he would have used the Irish army to drive the Scottish settlers out of Ulster with fire and sword and to attack Scotland itself; it was in this temper that he now faced a new Parliament, the most momentous that England has ever seen. This Parliament, which first met in November, 1640, was not finally dissolved until twenty years later and has the fitting name of the Long Parliament. From the first it waged determined war upon Charles's policy. Strafford's proud and narrow spirit had kept him from foreseeing what would be its attitude, for



THE EXECUTION OF STRAFFORD AT THE TOWER, 1641.

he himself became at once the chief object of attack. The Commons, led by Pym, impeached Strafford for high treason, and life was the stake for which the chief actors in the drama were now playing. There is little to prove Strafford guilty of what was legally treason. Pym claimed that it was treason to depart from the constitutional authority exercised by the monarch, but it was doubtful whether the Lords, the judges in the case, would take this view, and in the end Strafford was condemned, not after a fair trial, but by a special bill of attainder, passed

through both Houses after much discussion. The king, with England and Scotland united against him, had not the courage to refuse assent to it, and on May 12, 1641, with calm dignity Strafford went to the block, the first of many leaders whose lives the bitter struggle was to claim. Laud was sent to prison, to die later as Strafford died. The Parliament, now supreme, passed an act insuring its own meeting at least every third year; it forced Charles to assent to a revolutionary bill that Parliament might not be dissolved without its own consent; it abolished the Court of Star Chamber and the Court of High Commission which Charles had used to carry out his policy of coercion, and even gave compensation to their former victims.


So long as the Scots and the Parliament were leagued together Charles could do nothing. But the league was unnatural. Many of the English disliked the Presbyterianism which the Scots insisted that England should adopt, while the Scots, on the other hand, cared little for the political issues which seemed vital to Pym and Hampden. Having failed in England, Charles went to Scotland to try the magic of a king's presence, with the result that in September the Scottish army retired from England. And now Ireland complicated the situation. In 1641 the Roman Catholics of Ulster rose. There were dreadful scenes of massacre, and the tale of horror was told in England with exaggerations that make it hard to this day to learn the real truth. With three disturbed kingdoms Charles had his hands full, and civil war was near. Pym, Hampden, and others drew up what was called "the Grand Remonstrance," a portentous document containing two hundred and six clauses, reciting grievances, bitterly indicting the rule of Charles ever since his accession, and demanding that Parliament should control the king's ministers and that Church matters should be settled by an Assembly of Di-

The Grand
Remonstrance.

vines nominated by Parliament. A bare majority of the Commons accepted the Remonstrance, which was revolutionary in character, and Charles found that the Parliament's extreme claims were creating opposition favourable to himself. Goaded by his wife to resolute action, he, on January 3, 1642, impeached Pym, Hampden, and three others of his chief opponents for high treason, on the ground that they had aided the Scottish invader. He went down in person to the House to arrest them, but they had fled. London espoused their cause riotously, and a few days later Charles himself was obliged to leave the capital. Civil war had really begun.

The outbreak of war and the division of parties.

On August 22, 1642, with great ceremony Charles raised the royal standard at Nottingham. It was the open invitation to the nation to rally round its king. The rich southeast of England, with London, stood, on the whole, by the Parliament. The north and west, poorer and with a population more scattered, were with the king.



"ROUNDHEAD"
ABOUT 1649.

Charles could appeal to the old sentiment of loyalty and to those who loved the Church of England or feared the despotism of Parliament more even than that of the king. His supporters were, in fact, the greater part of the nobility and landed gentry of England—the "Cavalier" class. Oxford and Cambridge were centres of royalism. On the other hand the towns, the trading classes, and as many of the gentry as had come under the influence of the revived religious spirit of the time and held to the sterner Puritanism, were with the Parliament. They were nicknamed "Roundheads" because some of them wore their hair short in protest against the prevailing fashion. Appar-



ently only the London apprentices did this; the leaders, as their portraits show, did not crop their hair. They were men of culture; Milton, the age's paragon of classic learning, was on the Puritan side.

The royalists, with their headquarters at Oxford, made it a supreme object to seize London. They had the best fighting material. "Their troops are gentlemen's sons,

younger sons, and persons of quality," said Oliver Cromwell, while the parliamentary soldiers were mostly "old decayed serving-men and tapsters." But this

The course of
the Civil War.

was in time altered by Cromwell himself, a gentleman farmer of Huntingdonshire, who became the greatest general of his age. In 1643 the Parliament lost its two chief ornaments, for Hampden was killed in an obscure skirmish at Chalgrove Field, and Pym soon followed to the tomb his victim Strafford. The war, like all civil war, broke up families and friendships, so



PRINCE RUPERT, SON OF ELIZABETH,
SISTER OF CHARLES I (1619-1682).

that those bound by the closest ties were arrayed against one another; sometimes it was waged ruthlessly — even the women camp-followers were put to the sword after Naseby. At first the cavaliers won success. On October 23, 1642, Rupert, Charles's nephew, easily defeated the parliamentary cavalry at Edgehill, though the battle itself, as a whole, was indecisive. In the southwest the royalist general, Hopton, met Sir

William Waller at Lansdown and at Roundway Down, in July, 1643, with a similar result of success dearly won. Rupert himself took Bristol by storm. The Earl of Newcastle beat the parliamentary generals, Lord Fairfax and his son Sir Thomas Fairfax, at Atherton Moor, near Bradford. But these successes were transient; there were minor victories on the other side, and when the war had gone on about two years the tide had slowly turned against Charles. Those opposed to the king had

begun to find their natural leaders. The Parliament had been anxious to put men of rank in the front, and the Earl of Essex, son of the spoiled favourite whom Elizabeth sent to the block in 1601, commanded its armies until his place was taken by Sir Thomas Fairfax in 1645. Essex lacked decision, while Fairfax, though able, was without some of the qualities of a leader, and the fame of both is overshadowed by that of Oliver Cromwell. With instinctive military genius Cromwell organized a cavalry regiment fired with the Puritan spirit, and on July 2, 1644, after a desperate struggle, he and the Scottish leader David Leslie, against whom, six years later, he was to pit his strength at Dunbar, had the chief share in completely overwhelming the royalists at Marston Moor.

The first reverses on the Parliamentary side promoted efficiency in the end, for they drew attention to the faults of the leaders. Cromwell accused of incompetence even the Earl of Manchester, the general under whom he himself fought at Marston Moor. There was inquiry by the House of Commons, and at last vigorous action in a Self-Denying Ordinance, passed by Parliament in 1645, which forced all members who were officers to give up their commands; then only a few of the specially competent

The success
of the New
Model Army.

were reappointed. Hitherto there had been defects in regard to discipline, pay, and unity of action, but now Sir Thomas Fairfax, the commander-in-chief, with Cromwell as his chief lieutenant, reorganized the army on "The New Model," under which the men were to receive regular pay, to submit to strict discipline, and, above all, to have officers deeply convinced that they fought in the cause of God. This organization of the New Model Army really made the cause of Charles hopeless, and when, on June 14, 1645, Fairfax and Cromwell met him at Naseby, Cromwell's cavalry carried all before it. Naseby was a moral as well as a military defeat,

for the victors seized Charles's correspondence with Henrietta Maria, which showed that he planned to bring over Irish Roman Catholics to reduce England, and that he had no thought of peace except on his own terms. From such a reverse Charles could not recover. Throughout the war he was between two forces, for Scotland, after a hesitating pause, threw her weight against a king who would not pledge himself to Presbyterianism. Having



ALEXANDER LESLIE,
EARL OF LEVEN (1580?-1661).

made a bargain with the English Parliament for liberal pay, a Scottish army under Alexander Leslie, Earl of Leven, occupied the north of England, which otherwise would have been the king's stronghold. Charles's lieutenant, Montrose, won some meteoric successes in Scotland. Carrying out what Strafford had threatened, he brought over Irish troops, who, under a ferocious Highland chieftain, Alaster Macdonald,

committed frightful excesses, killing men, it was said, as light-heartedly as they would chickens. But little they cared for either side, and when gorged with booty they deserted Montrose. Leven's nephew, David Leslie, at last turned back from England to meet Montrose and at Philiphaugh in 1645 defeated him. Every prisoner taken was put to the sword, for Montrose had made the war one of savage and bloody reprisal. He himself for the time escaped, but in Scotland, as in England, Charles's cause was ruined. For nearly a year after Naseby he held out, but on May 5, 1646, he rode into the camp of the Scots who were besieging Newark. Though he expected still to be treated as king, in reality he had begun the captivity which ended only on the scaffold.

Meanwhile the Church of England had also been overthrown. In July, 1643, under the authority of Parliament an Assembly of Divines met at Westminster to settle religion on a new and better basis, and continued in session for no less than six years. The Assembly, Presbyterian in sentiment, drew up the "Westminster Confession," still the creed of the Scottish Church. By its plan the only religion to be tolerated in England was Presbyterianism. The Book of Common Prayer was abolished, and since there were no longer any religious differences between England and Scotland, the Parliament and people of both countries swore assent to a treaty called the "Solemn League and Covenant." This union meant death to the prelate who had tried to make episcopacy supreme, and on January 10, 1645, Laud, an old man of seventy-five, was at last sent to the block. But time was to show that Presbyterianism had only a slight hold upon England. The Independents, successors of the Separatists of Elizabeth's day, opposed its exclusive claims, and favoured freedom of worship to thoroughgoing Protestants of all kinds. Though weak in Parliament they were strong among the officers of the army, and the chief of their adherents was Oliver Cromwell himself, who had an enthusiasm for liberty of opinion. While the war went on Presbyterian and Independent had to unite against Charles, and even a Scottish invading army was welcome; but with Charles's defeat the old religious differences revived. The English wished especially to get rid of the foreign army, and in January, 1647, the Scots finally agreed, if their expenses were paid, to hand the captive king over to the Parliament and to withdraw. With their withdrawal not only was the unwelcome intruder removed, but the Presbyterian cause in England was fatally weakened.

There were differences between the army and the Presbyterian Parliament about the permanent settlement of

Issues about
religion.

the nation. If the king would assent to their system, the Presbyterians desired to restore him and to disband a great part of the victorious army. But the army would not disband until the work of revolution was complete, and its leaders demanded, not Presbyterian uniformity, but toleration in religion, democratic reforms in government, and the restoration of order in Ireland. Moreover, no less than £331,000 of arrears, in those days a huge sum, was due to the army. Yet the Parliament paid little heed to its de-

The army
secures
supreme power.



CORNET GEORGE JOYCE.

Dates of birth and death unknown.

Joyce is said to have been a London tailor. His humble origin may account for the short hair, affected by few leaders of the time.

mands and acted without tact, even proposing to pay the soldiers only one-sixth of what was due them. Cromwell, being prominent in both army and Parliament, tried hard to reconcile them, but failed, and the army he then led to decisive action. Hitherto Charles had been in the custody of the Parliament, but because of danger that he might escape to Scotland and put himself at the head of a new Presbyterian army, Cromwell's orders, seized the king at Holmby in Northamptonshire. Keeping him at Newmarket in its midst, the army fixed upon eleven leaders of the Presbyterian party in the Commons for attack, and drove them out of England. By August, 1647, the army had occupied the capital; it overawed the Parliament and was really master of the situation.

It seemed as if Charles might now make terms, and the army leaders tried to effect a settlement with him on

the basis of religious toleration for all Protestants, and parliamentary control of the government. But Charles,

The failure
of negotiations
with Charles.

believing that to see army and Parliament at war and himself the arbiter between them he had only to wait, refused the proffered terms.

Few thought as yet of doing without a king; on October 20, 1647, Oliver Cromwell made a three hours' speech in Parliament in favour of monarchy. But by November he had become convinced that it was hopeless to attempt to work with Charles, who, he then resolved, should never again rule in England. Meanwhile Charles, in the hope of getting away to France, eluded his jailers and escaped to the Isle of Wight, but in Carisbrooke Castle he found himself still the army's prisoner. Yet he had helped to break up the alliance between the army and the English Parliament, and soon, by promising to establish Presbyterianism in England for three years, he also drew away from the army the Scots, who cared little about the political questions in England, and desired only to see Presbyterianism triumphant. Early in 1648, when Charles gave his assurances on this point, the Scottish Parliament sent to London a peremptory demand that England should swear to the Covenant, adopt Presbyterianism, and suppress all other forms of Christian worship. The Presbyterian majority in Parliament was ready to assent, and royalists, Scots, and English Presbyterians seemed at length united against the army, now face to face with a supreme crisis. It happened that in April, 1648, the leaders of the army were assembled at Windsor for conference. They gave the first day of meeting, the 29th, to prayer; the second, led by Cromwell himself, to prayer and searching of heart. But on the third, while they were still in session, came the news that South Wales was in arms for the king's cause, and before those grave men separated to meet the danger they vowed solemnly that, if victorious in the renewed war, they would call "Charles Stuart,

that man of blood, to an account for the blood that he had shed."

The situation was critical for a time. Throughout the previous war the fleet had been firm for the Parliamentary side; now part of it went over to the royalist side. But the English army was led skilfully, and the tide of victory soon turned in its favour. Fairfax, the commander-in-chief, crushed the royalists in Kent and Essex, and took their stronghold, Colchester. Cromwell marched first into South Wales, and, victorious there, turned his face northward. In

Renewed civil
war and victory
for the army.



HENRY IRETON (1611-1651).

August, 1648, near Preston he fought a three days' battle with a Scottish army, badly led by the Duke of Hamilton, but outnumbering his own by three to one. It was the first struggle in which Cromwell had held supreme command, and his victory was complete. Ten thousand prisoners, among them Hamilton himself, fell into the hands of an army of not more than nine thousand. By the autumn the war was over, and on November 16, Ireton, Crom-


well's son-in-law, the man on the Parliamentary side best fitted by his studies for the task, made a last overture to Charles for the government of England: Parliament was to meet at least every second year and was to control the state. Perhaps Charles then had his last chance of life. Yet, though there were already clamours for his head, he sternly rejected these proposals. Both sides had become embittered. The view of the victors was that those who had renewed the war were guilty of murder; they shot two of the chief officers taken at Colchester,

and sent the Duke of Hamilton and other leaders to the block, and it was improbable that he, whom the army chiefly blamed, should escape. On December 1, 1648, with rude violence soldiers took Charles from Carisbrooke to Hurst Castle, on the Hampshire coast, where rescue was impossible, and when the Parliament protested against this proceeding, on it the army turned. On December 6 and 7 Colonel Pride stood at the entrance of the House of Commons and arrested, or refused entrance to, all members who were thought likely to oppose the authority of the army. The Parliament, thus reduced by "Pride's Purge" to little more than one-third of its former strength, now worked with the party in the state that soon made up its mind to destroy the king.

Charles was taken to Windsor. Even as late as on December 25, 1648, Oliver Cromwell spoke strongly for the king's life. But Charles would not even receive a messenger of the army with new overtures, and this seems finally to have decided Cromwell to bring him to trial. It was a course that required all his resolution. The House of Lords, in which there were now rarely more than a dozen members, refused to aid in judging the king, and the Scots, always strong for the monarchy, protested against the menace of death to him; but a few determined men carried out what they believed to be the will of God. On January 6, the purged Commons took the revolutionary step of creating on its own authority a High Court of Justice consisting of 135 persons (of whom only 68 would act) to try Charles for treason in levying war upon the Parliament and kingdom. On January 20, he was brought to Westminster Hall, but he refused to plead or to acknowledge the court that tried him. The proceedings went on for a week. Many of Charles's judges would have shrunk from carrying the case through to the end had not Cromwell and Ireton held them to their task. "I tell you," Cromwell answered

The trial and
execution of
the king.

to some questionings of Algernon Sydney, "we will cut off his head with the crown upon it." On January 27 the




THE HOUSE OF COMMONS.

From a print of 1648.

king was sentenced to death. He still firmly believed that to no human tribunal was he responsible, and before that of God he was ready to stand: "I fear not death. Death is not terrible to me; I bless my God I am prepared." On a frosty morning, the 30th of January, 1649, with his guards he walked rapidly from St. James's Palace across the park to Whitehall. For two or three hours he was kept waiting in a bedchamber of the palace, but about two in the afternoon came the final scene. When the king stepped through a window of the banquetting hall to the scaffold he was in the presence of a great crowd thronging the streets, the windows, and the roofs of houses. He spoke, but his voice could hardly reach beyond those with him on the scaffold. "I am the

martyr of the people," he said, and in his heart he believed that the laws and liberties of England were safer in a king's hands than in those of the Parliament. The axe—the very one probably which had been used on Strafford—fell, and the executioner silently held up the bleeding head. A groan, "such a groan," said an eye witness, "as I never heard before and desire that I may never hear



THE EXECUTION OF CHARLES I.

again," burst from the crowd, and it was typical of the horror with which all Europe regarded the final act of the army.

SUMMARY OF DATES

The Hampton Court Conference was in **1604**. **The Gunpowder Plot** was in **1605**. The Colony of Virginia was founded in **1607**. In **1614** James dissolved his second Parliament ("The Addled Parliament") in anger, and imprisoned some members. The Plymouth Colony began in **1620**. James I's third Parliament impeached and

forced the dismissal of Francis Bacon in 1621. War with Spain broke out in 1624. James died in 1625, and the struggle between King and Parliament soon became acute under Charles I. The Commons drew up **The Petition of Right in 1628**, and in 1629 Charles dissolved Parliament, sent Sir John Eliot and others to the Tower, and ruled for eleven years without a Parliament. The Colony of Massachusetts Bay was founded in 1630. Wentworth went to Ireland in 1633 as Lord Deputy, and Laud became Archbishop of Canterbury in 1633. In 1637 John Hampden refused to pay the ship money levied by Charles; in 1639 the Scots forced Charles to make **The Pacification of Berwick**, and to promise to let Scotland settle her own religious questions. The Parliament of England met in 1640 and attacked **Strafford**, who was executed in 1641, and **Laud**, who met the same fate in 1645. **The Grand Remonstrance** was made in November, 1641, and **Civil War** began in 1642. Its chief battles were **Edgehill, 1642, Marston Moor, 1644, and Naseby (final Royal defeat), 1645**. The Parliament joined the Scots in **The Solemn League and Covenant in 1643**, and in that year the **Westminster Assembly** began to sit. **The Scots gave up Charles**, who surrendered to them in 1646, **to the English Parliament in 1647**. Disputes arose between the Parliament and the Army. **Renewed Civil War** due to Charles I's negotiations broke out in 1648, in December of that year **Pride's Purge** gave the Army control of the Parliament, and **Charles was beheaded on January 30, 1649**.

BOOKS FOR REFERENCE

Ranke, *History of England*, chiefly in the seventeenth century (6 vols., 1875); *Gardiner, *History of England from 1603 to 1642* (10 vols., 1884); *Gardiner, *History of the Great Civil War* (3 vols., 1897); Clarendon, *History of the Rebellion*; edited by Macray (6 vols., 1888); Foster, *Life of Sir John Eliot* (2 vols., 1864); *Goldwin Smith, *Three English Statesmen (Pym, Cromwell, and Pitt)*, (1882); *Carlyle, *Oliver Cromwell's Letters and Speeches* (3 vols., 1897); Stainer, *Speeches of Oliver Cromwell* (1900); *Firth, *Oliver Cromwell* (1900); Firth, *Cromwell's Army* (1902); *Eggleston, *The Beginners of a Nation (the English Colonists in America)*, (1897).

CHAPTER XV

The Commonwealth and the Protectorate

(1649-1660—11 years)

The Commonwealth.....	1649-1653
Oliver Cromwell, Protector.....	1653-1658
Richard Cromwell, Protector.....	1658-1659

[Religious controversy continued to give the dominant note to the period in Europe. Within the Roman Catholic Church itself the violent dispute between Jesuits and Jansenists in France was marked by the brilliant writings of Pascal against the Jesuits. The scientific spirit was, however, growing strong, as the work of Newton, Leibnitz, and others in the next age showed.]

At no time did public opinion in England approve of Charles I's execution. A story is told that Cromwell went alone, late at night, to the chamber at Whitehall where Charles's body lay, lifted the lid from the coffin, gazed long upon the dead face, and then sighed out, "Cruel necessity." The army had come to think that Charles was the last barrier to progress, and that to save the state he must be removed. His death left England in the hands of an oligarchy, the remnant or "Rump" of the purged Long Parliament. Less than one hundred members now sat in it, but on the theory that the people were supreme, and that it was chosen by the people, it asserted absolute authority and acted with rapid decision. On February 6, 1649, it abolished the House of Lords; on February 7, the office of king; and on May 19, it declared England a republic. The nation was not asked to approve of this

The Long
Parliament
declares Eng-
land a republic.

revolution, for the Parliament, chosen nearly ten years earlier, deemed itself clothed with final supremacy. It named a Council of State, half as large as itself, to carry on the government, and committees of this council ruled England.

The new government had abundant use for the consuming energy which at first it showed. A royalist army held the greater part of Ireland, the Estates of Scotland recognised Charles's son, and monarchical Europe was hostile to the republic that had slain a king. Most pressing was the Irish question, and the Parliament promptly named Oliver Cromwell Lord Lieutenant and Commander-in-Chief in Ireland. In the summer of 1649 Cromwell went to Ireland resolved to bring order out of its chaos, and his work there is to this day a bitter memory. He had to deal with a terrible situation. In her last days Elizabeth had confiscated immense areas in Ireland on account of rebellions against the crown. A little later James I carried on systematic "plantations" of Protestant settlers in the north, and between these and the Roman Catholics, whom they really ruled, there was intense bitterness. Strafford's iron hand had checked discontent, but after he retired the province of Ulster was, in 1641, desolated by a cruel revolt, punished in the succeeding years by horrors not less cruel. There was a medley of parties. The Irish Roman Catholics thought that the time was come to throw off the Protestant yoke; the Irish royalists fought for a king; the Puritans for a Parliament determined to retain Protestant supremacy; and a new faction was created when the Pope sent a legate, Rinuccini, who was to annex Ireland either to the Holy See or to some continental state. In time the Roman Catholic interests made a powerful combination, which hoped for the king's support; but when, in 1641, Charles sent the Earl (afterward the Duke) of Ormonde to Ireland to take up

Cromwell in
Ireland.

the work of Strafford, he would not accept the demands of the Irish Catholics, whom he, like all Englishmen of that age, looked upon as little better than savages. With Charles I's captivity, the royalist cause in Ireland was for a time hopeless, and Ormonde, fearing the English Puritan less than the Irish Catholic, surrendered Dublin to



JAMES BUTLER,
DUKE OF ORMONDE (1610-1688).

the Parliament and retired to France. When the second civil war broke out in England in 1648 he returned; the papal agent Rinuccini fled, and Roman Catholic and Protestant royalists drew together. The execution of Charles I cemented this union, and in time nearly all Ireland, except Dublin and Derry, was in Ormonde's hands. It was expected that Charles II would land in Ireland as its king, and use that basis for his attack upon the regicide com-

monwealth. Ormonde laid siege to Dublin, and the situation was serious when Oliver Cromwell landed at Dublin, on August 13, 1649, with some 12,000 tried veterans of the civil war. He proclaimed that he was come "to ask an account of the innocent blood that hath been shed," and soon the Irish learned what this meant. Three weeks after landing, Cromwell was before Drogheda, in which were some of Ormonde's best regiments under Sir Arthur Aston. When the place refused to surrender, after a severe struggle Cromwell took it by storm and put to the sword about three thousand people, some of whom were non-combatants. Many Roman Catholic priests and friars were killed, but the stories of the massacre of women and children in cold blood are probably false. The truth itself is bad enough. In St. Peter's Church, where, as Cromwell notes

with Puritan fervour, mass had been celebrated on the previous Sunday, 1,000 were killed by his troops. The church steeple, in which many had taken refuge, was set on fire, and the burning wretches in the flames died with curses for their assailants on their lips. "I wish," said Cromwell, "that all honest hearts may give the glory of this to God alone, to whom, indeed, the praise of this mercy belongs." He marched on Wexford, gave its garrison an hour in which to yield unconditionally, and, when they refused, carried that place also by storm, and again put some two or three thousand people to the sword. Cromwell's defence of this awful rigour was that it would terrify the land into submission and save further bloodshed. Perhaps it did. Town after town opened its gates to him, and within a few months the greater part of Ireland was in his hands.

Then came the cruellest part of Cromwell's work. The Puritan mind knew no lenience for Roman Catholics, and least of all for Roman Catholic Irish; the Irish landholders were now at the conqueror's mercy, and the soldiers who followed Cromwell expected pay in Irish land. England annexed Ireland, which during the strife had lost one-third of its population, abolished its Parliament, and carried out an enormous scheme of eviction. The Catholic landowners were ordered to remove from their homes into a region of Connaught, for the most part barren and desolate, and after May 1, 1654, those found east of the appointed boundary were to be punished by death. The actual tillers of the soil this stern measure did not greatly affect. They remained where they were, and only changed masters; it was the educated and well-to-do landowners who suffered, and young and old were alike compelled to make their toilsome way, usually on foot, into Connaught. Of those who refused to go severe examples were made. And there were other sufferers whose lot was more terrible.

The Protestant
domination
in Ireland.

Irish officers and soldiers, numbering, it is said, about 30,000 or 40,000, went, after their cause was lost, from Ireland to the Continent, to fight in after years the battles of other states against England; but of their wives and families many remained in Ireland, to be driven from their homes, and, in some cases, to be shipped to the West Indies and sold as slaves. Massacre was terrible, but the long suffering of eviction and slavery was far worse. Nor did time undo these wrongs. The day came when the Puritan party, which laid so heavy a hand on Ireland, itself fell in England; but for the sufferers in Ireland Charles II, when restored, although he promised much, did little. It is true that in 1661 the revived Irish Parliament passed an Act of Settlement which provided that Roman Catholic landowners, who had been in no way connected with the rebellion of 1641 and following years, should get back their lands, but the Cromwellian soldiers were also to retain their grants, or to be given an equivalent elsewhere in Ireland. Moreover, few Irish Catholics could prove their absolute freedom from rebellion. Finally by the Act of Explanation of 1665 the new owners gave up one-third of their land. Some Catholic proprietors recovered estates, but about two-thirds of the land of Ireland remained in possession of a small number of Protestants, who continued to rule the country and to have the native Irish as their hewers of wood and drawers of water. After the fall of the Puritan republic in England the worship of the Anglican Church alone was tolerated in Ireland, and not only many Roman Catholics, but also Presbyterians, left the country rather than submit to the final Stuart settlement.

Oliver Cromwell himself remained in Ireland less than a year, for early in 1650 there was pressing need of him elsewhere. It was evident that England must subdue not only Ireland but Scotland. Six days after Charles I's



THE SCOTS HOLDING THEIR YOUNG KING'S NOSE TO THE GRINDSTONE.

death the Scottish Estates proclaimed his son, Charles II, King of Great Britain, France, and Ireland—a direct act of defiance of the English republic. But the

Cromwell in Scotland.

great mass of the Scots, led by the Earl of Argyle, head of the great Campbell clan, were resolved that if Charles ruled at all, it must be as a Presbyterian king. Montrose thought to win Scotland for Charles without the Covenant, and early in 1650 landed in the north with a small force. It was soon cut to pieces, Montrose was taken, and on May 21 the adventurous leader against covenanting Scotland was hanged at Edinburgh as an outlaw. Since Scotland thus showed its resolve to support Presbyterianism, and Cromwell had destroyed all hope from Ireland, Charles now yielded, took the Covenant, and declared that his father, in refusing it, had opposed the will of God. Time was to show the value of an easy-going voluptuary's adoption of the sternest

Puritanism. He went to Scotland in June, 1650, kept strict fasts, heard long prayers and sermons, and tried to appear grave, but all the time "with his tongue in his cheek."

On royalist Presbyterianism the English republic must make war, and Cromwell entered Scotland in July. He

The conquest
of Scotland.

was now the English commander-in-chief, for Fairfax resigned rather than attack his fellow Presbyterians. In September Cromwell, with an inferior force, overwhelmed the Scots, under David Leslie, at Dunbar, took 10,000 prisoners, occupied Edinburgh, and was soon busy rebuking the Presbyterians for their hostile attitude to their triumphant spiritual brethren, the English Independents. In February, 1651, he lay at the point of death from fever, but by June he was again in the field carrying the war into the Highlands. Leslie, hoping that a royalist rising would greet the young king who was with him, took the bold course of leaving Cromwell in the north and marching south into England, which, however, gave a cold welcome to a king supported by a Scottish invading army. But not until the Scots were as far south as Worcester did Cromwell overtake them. On September 3, the anniversary of Dunbar, there was another terrible battle, and Cromwell won a complete victory. Though Charles II

managed, after many perils, to escape to France, not a regiment or company of the Scottish army reached the



ARCHIBALD CAMPBELL,
EIGHTH EARL AND FIRST MARQUIS OF
ARGYLE (1598-1661).

border. Thousands perished; half the nobility of Scotland were prisoners in the hands of Cromwell, and within a few months Scotland itself was a conquered country. The victors abolished the Scottish Parliament, united the country to England, and allowed it and Ireland each to send thirty members to the Parliament at London. Though it seemed a pitiful ending to the long struggle against Charles I, in which Scotland had played so great a part, Scotland gained something. She had free trade with her larger neighbour, she had peace and order unknown before, and full play for the spiritual forces of Presbyterianism. It was indeed a dark day for Scotland when the union ended with the restoration of Charles II.

While at home the republic served this glorious apprenticeship in war, Europe professed to scorn and despise it.

War with
Holland.

More than one of its envoys to the Continental states were murdered, and it could get no redress; royalist privateers, under Rupert, preyed upon its commerce, and were sheltered by foreign courts. To make its position secure the Commonwealth needed a great navy, and in Robert Blake found at length



CARDINAL MAZARIN
(1602-1661).

the man who could organize it. By the beginning of 1651 Blake had destroyed the greater part of Rupert's ships, and soon an English fleet entered the Mediterranean, attacked French commerce, and showed England to be formidable in regions new to her activity. Cardinal Mazarin made peaceful overtures in the end for France, and the two greatest continental powers, France and Spain, both recognised the republic.

But victory did not always wait upon the Commonwealth. In Holland, also a revolutionary and Protestant

republic, it found its most strenuous foe. The two states were commercial rivals, and in October, 1651, by the Navigation Act, England excluded the Dutch from trading with the English colonies, and forbade Dutch ships to bring to England the products of any country but their own. By May, 1652, these rivalries had brought on war. Blake was beaten off Dungeness by Tromp, the Dutch admiral; the command of the Channel passed for a time to the Dutch, and, probably in jest against the English, the story was told that Tromp carried a broom at his masthead to show his resolve to sweep them from the seas. In the Mediterranean too the English failed, and they did not recover themselves until February, 1653, when Blake once more secured command of the Channel.

A government's strength is tested most severely by defeat in war. In England there was much discontent, which turned against the Parliament. Its consuming energy changed in a few years to feeble inactivity, and some of its members were growing rich through bribes and spoils. It raised money by questionable means, selling not only the property of the king, including his magnificent collection of pictures, but also that of the bishops, deans, and cathedral chapters: it threatened the destruction of the cathedrals themselves, and even began the work at Lichfield. To meet the enormous expenditure of the war it sold the estates of many royalists, confiscating by a single act the property of six hundred and eighteen persons, most of them innocent of any real offence against the state. Partiality, injustice, the selfish pursuit of private ends, the greedy monopoly of office, and needless delay of business—the faults, in a word, of a narrow oligarchy—were, with truth, charged against the Parliament, and meanwhile those in earnest in the revolution, and especially the officers of the army, were demanding a really reformed government.

The decline of
the Long
Parliament.

Cromwell stood between the army and the Parliament, using his influence for moderation. Though the Parliament was determined to retain power and not to dissolve, the officers insisted that there should be a new election, a new Parliament, and a radical programme of reform. At the beginning of 1653 Cromwell could barely keep the army from using force against the Parliament, of which he himself soon despaired. It interfered with his plans for religious work in Wales, and it would not make reasonable terms with the Dutch. But the crowning offence came when it introduced a bill to make its own existence permanent: in future there was to be no general election; vacancies were merely to be filled as they occurred. On April 19, 1653, Cromwell held a conference with the Parliamentary leaders. They agreed to use their influence to delay the objectionable bill, but on the next morning, the 20th, news came to him at Whitehall that the Parliament was hurrying the bill through, with the intention, as soon as it was law, of adjourning until November. Angry at the broken promises, he hurried down to the House with a guard of soldiers, whom he stationed at the approaches. He took his seat as a member, and soon rose to speak. As he went on his anger mastered him. In violent language he charged the assembly with abuse of its powers, and individual members with profligacy, drunkenness, and corruption; and when his wrath was at a white heat, he turned to Harrison, a fellow officer, and ordered him to bring in the soldiers. They marched grimly in, and the members were forced to retire—Cromwell giving stern orders when there was any show of resistance. The mace, the symbol of the Parliament's authority, lay on the table. "What shall we do with this bauble?" said Cromwell. "Here, take it away." A bauble was the fantastically decorated baton carried by the court fool as a mock symbol of office. By no other term could Cromwell show more completely his contempt

The expulsion
of the Long
Parliament.

for what the Long Parliament had become. Its expulsion left the mastery of the three kingdoms with him and the army.

Would Cromwell make himself king, would he restore the Stuarts, or would he try to set up some new type of government? He summoned, in his own name, as "Captain General," about one hundred and forty of the Puritan leaders to form a new Parliament. They were, however, not chosen by the people. The Independent churches sent in names of approved persons, and Cromwell's Council of Officers chose from these the members of the Nominated Parliament, which was called the "Little" Parliament, from its small numbers, and sometimes "Barebones's" Parliament, from "Praise God" Barebones, the zealous junior member for London. It met on July 4. Cromwell looked upon this assembly with enthusiastic good-will, and hopes were high that a new era had dawned, and that by the wise and righteous men so carefully selected every abuse would now be reformed. The new Parliament was soon busily engaged. Some of the members worked zealously on their plans to end imprisonment for debt, to simplify the law, to abolish the Court of Chancery, to make the judges independent, and to give congregations the right to choose their own ministers. But some talked, too, of reducing the army, and of abolishing the Church tithe—the chief means of support of the ministers of religion—proposals that Cromwell disliked, and that aroused great opposition from those affected. The system which the Nominated Parliament represented was not satisfactory. There was no single head of the state, something indispensable to the English machinery of government, and no provision was made for elections in which the nation itself could be appealed to. Some of the leaders were ready with a complete constitution, while others wished to carry out radical reforms even in defiance of the army. But the moderate

party would do nothing to offend Cromwell, and finally, on December 12, 1653, with a plan for a better system in view, they carried in the House a resolution to hand their powers back to him, and to dissolve. When the minority protested against self-effacement soldiers dispersed them. Once more the three kingdoms were in Cromwell's hands.

To try to settle some permanent form of government was most necessary. Major-General Lambert had long pressed for a written constitution, and he and other officers now produced one called

Cromwell be-
comes Protector.

"The Instrument of Government," which Cromwell accepted. A state Church and religious liberty for all but Roman Catholics and Anglicans; a Parliament with a single chamber to meet at least every third year but not to be dissolved until it had sat five months; and a head of the government to be called a "Protector," who was to command the land and sea forces, were its chief features. Events moved rapidly in those days of revolution, and on December 16, 1653, the fourth day after the dissolved Parliament ceased to exist, Cromwell was installed as Protector under the new constitution. Though it was really the army which gave him his office, men noticed that he wore plain civilian's dress, for he knew that the rule of the soldier was hateful to England. Under the new constitution his sway was far from absolute. He had a Parliament with four hundred members from England, and from Ireland and Scotland thirty each; he could not veto its enactments, nor could he dismiss the Council of State of from thirteen to twenty-one members, who were to advise him. But the executive power was, on the other hand, wholly his, and made him the real ruler. When the Parliament met on September 3, 1654, the members showed at once a disposition to claim sole authority, and proceeded as if they might place further limits upon the Protector. But Cromwell insisted that he as well as they had a mandate from the nation and that they must

not alter the "Fundamentals" dividing authority between Parliament and himself. Within little more than a week his soldiers stood at the door of the House and barred the way to all who would not sign a formal "Recognition" of this position. About a hundred members were excluded. Later, the Parliament claimed control of the army, and then, with the tenacity of Charles I, Oliver insisted upon his prerogative as general by sea and land. On January 22, 1655, when the five lunar months of sitting had expired, he dissolved the Parliament as a menace to the public good. For nearly two years after this no Parliament sat, and Oliver Cromwell ruled England.

"A larger soul, I think, hath seldom dwelt in house of clay than his was," said a member of Cromwell's own

household. Like all men of genius, he was in advance of his age; he loved toleration when the best men of his time thought it sin to

allow error to exist without repression. Prompt, determined, and vigorous, he looked facts steadily in the face.

"There is nothing to be feared,"

he said, "but our own sin and sloth." Religious convictions

lay behind everything that he did. He told France that she

must not withdraw the toleration given to Protestants by the

Edict of Nantes; when he heard of the sufferings of the persecuted

Waldensian Church he wept, and himself gave £2,000

for its relief; he went into battle with a psalm, "Let God arise and let his enemies be

scattered," on his lips. Yet he was far removed from the grim and stern Puritan our fancy paints. He drank beer and light wine, used tobacco, and was passionately fond of music. When his daughter Frances was married, the



OLIVER CROMWELL (1599-1658).

dancing was kept up in Whitehall until five o'clock in the morning. He loved a jest, and would break off from serious work at Whitehall to make verses with Thurloe his secretary. His humour was grim enough. "What a crowd came out to your lordship's triumph!" was said to him in Bristol when he returned from victory in Ireland. "Yes," said Oliver, "but if it were to see me hanged how many more there would be." He was fond of hunting and hawking and liked good horses. His domestic affections were especially keen. But though gentle at home, his solid stature, massive head, big nose, and firm mouth show always the quality of strength; when once he had sought God's leading and made up his mind, nothing could shake his adamant will. Through it Charles I went to the scaffold. A little later the brother of the Portuguese ambassador was concerned in an assassination in the streets of London. England was engaged in delicate negotiations with Portugal, and every effort was made to induce Cromwell to spare the guilty man, but he was unrelenting, and on the day that one brother signed the Portuguese treaty with England the other went to the gallows. Living in an age of revolution in which the ultimate appeal was to force, Cromwell relied too much upon the strong arm as the best instrument of government. When he became Protector he was told that it was against the will of the nation. "There will be nine in ten against you." "Very well," said he, "but what if I disarm the nine and put a sword in the tenth man's hands? Would not that do the business?" He cared little for the niceties of constitutional theory, and was as ready to destroy an arbitrary Parliament as an arbitrary king. In his heart he was always a believer in the monarchical principle.

In the way of settled government were enormous obstacles. The Puritan party was profoundly divided. A fanatical section, led by Major-General Harrison, clamoured for the establishment of a Fifth Monarchy to succeed the

four ancient monarchies, and of this fifth monarchy Jesus Christ was to be king. "The Levellers," led by John Lilburne, were clamorous for democratic equality. Republicans like Vane and Ludlow, who had formerly acted with Cromwell, refused to recognise his government; and the Presbyterian party chafed under his policy of toleration. Lawyers attacked the legality of the Protector's rule, and some of the judges revealed doubts when the validity of taxes imposed by his ordinances was questioned. The Protector amidst these difficulties was firm and thoroughgoing. He held that his government was the only valid one in England, and those disputing its authority felt his heavy hand. At Salisbury, in March, 1655, the royalists rose under Colonel Penruddock. Cromwell's soldiers soon dispersed them, and then he divided England into eleven districts under as many major-generals, who preserved order with Spartan severity. They treated the royalists as irreconcilable, and forced them to pay a special tax to support the military force which held them down. The rule of the major-generals was efficient, but it was the undisguised rule of force, which did more, perhaps, than anything else to turn the nation against Cromwell's government.

In September, 1656, the Protector met his second Parliament under "The Instrument of Government." The Constitution permitted him to defer the meeting for another year, but England was at war with Spain and he needed money. His major-generals had promised that the elections should be favourable to the government, but everywhere protests appeared against military rule. Cromwell had to exclude no less than one hundred members from the House because of their disloyalty to him. But even the docile remainder condemned the sway of the soldiers. Already men's minds were turning to the old form of government by king and Parliament as the only possible

Cromwell's
difficulties.

Cromwell's
second
Parliament
under "The
Instrument of
Government."

one. This conviction was dominant in the revolutionary Parliament itself, and on March 25, 1657, by an overwhelming majority, it decided to ask Cromwell to become king and to rule England under the old forms. But Oliver's officers met the proposal with a storm of reproaches. After a terrible struggle they had got rid of one king; should they now have another? On March 31 the Parliament presented to Cromwell its proposal under the title of "The Humble Petition and Advice." He himself cared little for the title of king. It was only, he said, "a feather in a hat," but he was too much of an Englishman not to long, as the nation longed, for some government that would make the foundations of order secure, after all the failures of military despotism. Finally, after weeks of deliberation, he refused the title of king, but agreed to ac-

The "Petition
and Advice,"

cept the new constitution contained in "The Humble Petition and Advice," with the difference that the head of the state should be not king but Protector. There was now to be a second chamber; the Parliament was to enjoy most of the privileges of its ancient prototype; the Protector was to have regal powers, and to nominate both his own successor and the seventy members of the new second chamber. In June, 1657, Cromwell was once more installed as Protector, this time with ceremonial similar to that of an ancient coronation. In 1653 the army had made him Protector; now this was due to the Parliament, and he fondly hoped that as the nominee of the nation his rule had at last full validity.

His hopes proved vain; the English mind, accustomed to the slow growth of institutions, would freely accept only what time had sanctioned. The new Upper House, to which Cromwell named his chief friends, excited special derision, and in the Lower House the Republicans gained control. In January, 1658, the new Parliament met and within a month it was quarrelling with Cromwell. Though

Cromwell's
quarrel with
his last
Parliament.

he called the new second chamber the House of Lords the republican Commons would call it only "the other House," and claimed that a real House of Lords would be a menace to the liberties of the nation. There was even a plot to depose Cromwell from the headship of the army and to put Fairfax in his place, and the Protector, as usual, took decisive action. On February 4, 1658, he summoned both chambers before him, rebuked them for disloyalty to "The Humble Petition and Advice," told them that they were playing the game of the royalists, and after a fiery speech ended with this: "I do dissolve this Parliament, and let God be judge between you and me." He expected in due course to summon a new Parliament, but in that year he died.

Such were some of the difficulties amid which Oliver Cromwell carried on the government of England. Yet she never had five years more glorious than The Dutch War. those of his protectorate. The Dutch War, disastrous at first, turned to the advantage of England; it was a naval war, and Holland lost some 1,400 sail, among them 120 men-of-war. Cromwell, like Napoleon, had a splendid audacity in planning to control the world. His desire was that England and Holland should unite to form one state, that Holland should take Asia as her sphere of influence, and England, America. Not only would trade prosper; they would carry Protestantism to two continents. But Holland did not relish proposals that meant the dominance over her of England, the stronger partner; they were gradually modified, and finally, when amidst great rejoicings peace was concluded on April 5, 1654, the plan of union was abandoned. That Cromwell should have pressed it, reveals his failure to understand national feeling in Holland.

Though the Dutch plan failed, Cromwell was resolved to extend England's supremacy, and he next attacked Spain, which at first had been more friendly than France

to the English-republic. It was the Elizabethan struggle revived. Spain still massacred or enslaved Englishmen found within the precincts of the Caribbean Sea, and even in time of formal peace England fought her pretensions. In December, 1654, Cromwell sent an expedition to the West Indies. His plan was to seize San Domingo, Cuba, and other islands, and the Isthmus of Panama, if possible, and to win control of the trade routes of Spanish America. But from the first the venture was badly managed, and for this Cromwell must be chiefly blamed. He divided the command between William Penn, father of another William Penn, famous later in American history, and Robert Venables, the one as admiral, the other as general. Their force of about 9,000 men consisted not of tried Puritan soldiers, but of the riffraff of London streets, and disreputable recruits from Barbados and other West Indian colonies. It was a debauched and cowardly host, badly equipped and badly led. Repulsed from San Domingo in 1655 with something like panic, they soon after attacked Jamaica, whose Spanish defenders had but five hundred fighting men. The English seized and still hold the island, but, notwithstanding this gain, Cromwell looked upon the whole expedition as an ignominious failure, and sent both Penn and Venables to the Tower for a time.

Cromwell had a magnificent fleet of one hundred and sixty sail, and used it in time of peace in a way that international law would not now tolerate. When she seized Jamaica, England was at peace with Spain. In 1654 Blake sailed to the Mediterranean, also in a time of nominal peace, with orders to attack not only the shipping of France and Spain, but also that of Algiers and Tunis, the two Mohammedan states of North Africa. France was not anxious to fight England, but Spain finally declared war in February, 1656. The English soon won new naval

War with Spain
and seizure of
Jamaica.

Cromwell's
foreign policy.

laurels: on April 20, 1657, Blake entered the harbour of Santa Cruz, in Teneriffe, and without the loss of an English ship destroyed the Spanish treasure-fleet of sixteen sail. Worn out by his labours, he died on the way home, leaving a name in the annals of the English navy second only to Drake and Nelson. England entered into formal alliance with France against Spain: Cromwell's redcoats fought side by side with Frenchmen under Turenne before Dunkirk, and in June, 1658, by securing that fortress, Cromwell gave England a stronghold upon the Continent of Europe like Calais of old, and like her present fortress of Gibraltar. A poet of the time calls him "The World's Protector." At his demand the Duke of Savoy stopped his atrocious persecutions of the Waldensians, and Cromwell held himself ready also to aid the Protestants of northern Europe. His was no policy of "splendid isolation."

The command of the seas gave Oliver easy communication with the colonial possessions of Great Britain. At one time he himself had thought of going to America, and he always took a keen interest in colonial matters. The imperial mind that united Scotland, Ireland, and England was not without schemes of colonial empire. New England fell readily into line with the Puritanism of the mother land, and when Barbados and Virginia showed a disposition to take sides with the enemies of the Commonwealth, they were sternly repressed. Eager for territory, Cromwell was about to attack the Dutch colony of Manhattan—now New York State—when peace was made with Holland in 1654. He seized from France a great part of what is now Nova Scotia and New Brunswick in Canada, and England held this territory until Charles II handed it back. As we have seen, it was Cromwell who secured Jamaica. The government of Charles II, though subservient to France, continued Cromwell's colonial policy as against other


Cromwell's
colonial policy.

states, drove the Dutch out of North America, and refused to cede Jamaica back to Spain. In fact, Cromwell and his associates created a precedent in colonization for the Stuarts and their successors.

At home, Cromwell steadily pursued the work, long demanded by the army, of reforming the laws of England. He amended the procedure and reduced the fees of the Court of Chancery, and tried thoroughly to reform the criminal law, but did not rule long enough to do it. He reduced killing in a duel to the level of murder. His government showed great zeal for education, and as Chancellor of the University of Oxford, he took especial interest in higher education. He planned a university for the north, and founded a college at Durham, which was dispersed at the Restoration, but refounded in the nineteenth century. Cromwell, like Henry VIII, laid hands on Church lands, but the scandalous misuse of Henry was not repeated: the revenues went to schools and colleges, and to other purposes of government. The Puritan rule was less inquisitorial than it is often pictured, for Cromwell's government was the most tolerant of religious differences that England had known. "Popery and Prelacy" were, it is true, suppressed. A Roman priest was put to death in 1654, and against the use of the Anglican ritual also the law was stern. Cromwell himself, when Governor of Ely, stopped a service in the cathedral choir with the stern summons to the clergyman, "Leave off your fooling and come down, sir." His soldiers sometimes broke into churches, destroyed crosses and crucifixes, and even beautiful stained glass, and tore to pieces prayer-books and surplices. None the less was Cromwell's Church comprehensive, and it required no uniformity of doctrine or service. Presbyterians, Independents, and Baptists, varying greatly in details of doctrine, became rectors and vicars of English parishes. They had good incomes, for Cromwell would not hear of the

Cromwell's
domestic policy.

abolition of an Established Church with its tithes. He was also zealous to insure high character in the religious teachers. Thirty-eight commissioners, who came to be known as Triers, sat permanently at London, and their chief duty was to see that no unworthy person ministered in the State Church. Even for those outside the Estab-



PURITANS DESTROYING THE CROSS IN CHEAPSIDE.

lishment Cromwell favoured tolerance. His government winked at the use of the Anglican ritual in London. The new Society of Friends, or "Quakers," as they were contemptuously called, because they sometimes trembled with religious emotion, suffered cruel persecutions in various parts of England, but Cromwell himself showed kindness to their leader, George Fox. Since the days of Edward I the Jews had been kept out of England, but Cromwell allowed some of them to come back, though even he could not secure for them the legal toleration that he desired. He deprecated the persecution of Roman Catholics, and

saved many from it. In a word, he was the steadfast friend of free opinion. But when opinion was allied with action against his authority, it found him relentless. The Cavaliers complained loudly that the Puritan moral *régime* was intolerable. The major-generals acted as moral police, gagged the press, punished breaches of Sunday observance, profane language, cock-fighting, and horse-racing. But in regard to some of these things even modern governments find strict laws necessary.

In reality oppressive taxation was the chief fault of Cromwell's rule. War is a costly game, and the device of loans to lighten its immediate burden was as yet hardly known. In Cromwell's last year the deficit was mounting at the rate of £400,000 annually, half the total revenue of Charles I, and Cromwell was at his wit's end for money. Ireland and Scotland had to pay a crushing burden of taxation; in England the property of royalists was the chief source of relief from financial difficulties, and the government was guilty of many unjust seizures.

At fifty-nine Cromwell was an old man. He was in middle age before he began the arduous labours of war, and they wore him out quickly. Mortal illness seized him in August, 1658. They removed him from Hampton Court to Whitehall for change of air. On the night of August 31 he was overheard in prayer, and his prayer was for the English people. "Give them," prayed Cromwell, "consistency of judgment, one heart, and mutual love, and go on to deliver them. . . . Teach those who look too much upon Thy instruments to depend more upon Thyself." Nor did he forget to pray for his enemies. "Pardon such as desire to trample upon the dust of a poor worm, for they are Thy people too. And pardon the folly of this short prayer, even for Jesus Christ's sake, and give us a good night, if it be Thy pleasure." He died on the 3d of September;

Cromwell's
heavy taxation.

The death of
Cromwell.

it was his most glorious anniversary, for on it he had won Dunbar and Worcester. We think of Cromwell as an autocrat. But while supreme in England through his own efficiency and resolution, he knew that the complete control of affairs lay beyond him, and desired to govern with the consent of the nation. By nature and conviction he was neither despot nor democrat. When the convulsion of revolution was over, his mind turned to the restoration, not indeed of the Stuart kings, but of the old method of rule by Sovereign, Lords and Commons. He tried to keep the army out of politics, and to give Parliament its old place of authority, but five stormy years were too few for his task. The real majority was always against him. Royalists, Republicans, Presbyterians, even the army in large degree, were at heart hostile to the unbending sway of the Protector.

Cromwell's son Richard became Protector with the quietness and regularity of hereditary kingship: it was said at the time that for about five months not even a dog ventured to wag its tongue



RICHARD CROMWELL (1626-1712).

The succession
and deposition
of Richard
Cromwell.

against him. He was dignified, and could speak well, but with the tastes of a country gentleman, not of a statesman, he lacked in grasp of public affairs. Only a soldier or a king could rule England, and Richard was neither. The army needed a real leader. The war with Spain was going on, and the soldiers' pay was in such arrears that before Oliver's funeral there was talk even of seizing his body as a hostage. Richard summoned a Parliament to meet

on January 27, 1659, and showed some disposition to pit its influence against that of the army, but on April 21, 1659, he found himself surrounded in Whitehall by a military force, and was obliged to dissolve the Parliament. Once more soldiers at Westminster kept the members from taking their places. With no Parliament the army was supreme, but as Fleetwood and Lambert, the army leaders, well knew, the heart of the nation was against military rule. The republicans raised a mighty clamour for the "good old time" of the republic, and since the Long Parliament, duly chosen by the English people, had been the mouthpiece of the republic until Oliver dismissed it, a cry went forth for the Long Parliament. The army chiefs at last called it together, and on May 7, 1659, forty-two of the old "Rump" of the Long Parliament, so ignominiously dismissed six years before by Oliver, came together at Westminster with Lenthall, the former speaker, at their head. The summoning of the Long Parliament meant the end of the Cromwellian dynasty. On this both Parliament and army were agreed, and Richard abdicated on May 25, to live for fifty-three years still, in deep privacy, and haunted for a long time by the fear of arrest for debt—an ignominious fate for the heir of the Protector. Again came the great question, what permanent government could be set up? The desire for a Stuart restoration was growing. Those who supported in Cromwell the principle of monarchy were, in default of any possible ruler but a king, now becoming royalists. The Rump and the leaders of the army soon quarrelled, for the Rump claimed to control everything, including appointments in the army, and on October 13, 1659, once more the army expelled the Rump, as Cromwell had done.

A new portent now rose in Scotland. General George Monk commanded the army which held down conquered Scotland, and had become practically Protector of that

country as Oliver was of England. His position in the North, remote from English faction, with a well-disciplined army and a supply of money that he had prudently saved, was commanding, and to him the expelled Rump appealed. His answer was decisive. Declaring his resolve to sustain civil as against military government, he took the side of the Parliament. The army leaders sent Lambert to the north to bar Monk's advance into England, and it looked like renewed civil war, but as Monk advanced many joined him, among them Fairfax, the old Parliamentary commander, and there could be no doubt that public opinion was on his side. Lambert's force melted away, and on February 3, 1660, Monk entered London as the champion of the restored Rump, which made him Captain-General, as Cromwell had been. In the

light of later events, it is easy to suppose that Monk desired from the first to restore the Stuarts, but this is very doubtful. What he really intended was to follow public opinion. Even yet hardly any one spoke openly for a king, but the drift of men's minds was unmistakable, and, in fact, without civil war nothing but a restoration of the Stuarts was possible. Monk called the surviving members of the Long Parliament, whom "Pride's Purge" had expelled, to join the Rump, but first he pledged them to

Monk's march
from Scotland.
The Restora-
tion.



GEORGE MONK, DUKE OF ALBEMARLE
(1608-1670).

agree to a dissolution and to the free election of a new House. On March 16, 1660, the Long Parliament, after an existence of twenty eventful and stormy years, came to an end by its own act, and England was called upon to choose a Parliament to settle the constitution of the state. At once there was an amazing outburst in favour of Charles II, and Monk now easily made up his mind. The new Parliament met on April 25. Within a week it had voted for a Stuart restoration, and before the month of May ended Charles II was on the throne of England.

SUMMARY OF DATES

The remnant of the Long Parliament that overthrew Charles I abolished the House of Lords in February, 1649, and in May declared England to be a Commonwealth. Cromwell went to Ireland in August, 1649, and the Massacres of Drogheda and Wexford soon followed. War with Scotland broke out in 1650. Dunbar was fought on Sept. 3, 1650, and Worcester on Sept. 3, 1651. Scotland and Ireland, completely subdued, were united with England into one state. War broke out with Holland in 1652. Cromwell expelled the Long Parliament on April 20, 1653. The "Nominated Parliament" met in July, 1653. When it dissolved itself Cromwell was, by the "Instrument of Government," in effect an act of the army, made Lord Protector in December, 1653. He made peace with Holland in 1654. The First Protectorate Parliament met in September, 1654, and was dissolved in January, 1655. A royalist rising under Penruddock broke out in 1655, and to insure order, Cromwell divided England into eleven military districts, despotically ruled by eleven major-generals. War with Spain broke out in 1656. The Second Protectorate Parliament met in September, 1656. Cromwell refused the title of king in 1657, and in that year, by the "Humble Petition and Advice," the work of Parliament, he was again named Lord Protector under a new constitution. His death in 1658 was followed by the resignation of his son Richard as Protector in 1659. The Long Parliament dissolved itself in March, 1660, and a free Parliament in April led to the Restoration of Charles II in 1660.

BOOKS FOR REFERENCE

Ranke, Clarendon, *Carlyle, and *Firth, as in previous chapter; *Gardiner, *History of the Commonwealth and Protectorate* (3 vols., 1902); Masson, *Life of Milton* (7 vols., 1880); Morley, *Oliver Cromwell*.

CHAPTER XVI

The Restoration and the Revolution

(1660-1689—29 years)

Charles II born 1630; succeeded (restored) 1660; died 1685.

James II " 1633; " 1685; left England 1688.

[During the whole of the period Louis XIV ruled in France and had the ambition to dominate Europe. His Revocation of the Edict of Nantes in 1685 was an attempt finally to crush Protestantism in France. The Stuart kings lent themselves to Louis's plans, and were in his pay, while English public opinion was intensely hostile to him.]

THERE was a tempest of joy on Charles II's return. For twenty-five miles, from Rochester to London, he passed through cheering, half-frantic multitudes. Scarcely has enthusiasm been more spontaneous and real, for Cromwellians, Presbyterians, Cavaliers, all welcomed him as their saviour from military rule: even the army itself, drawn up fifty thousand strong on Blackheath, raised no note of dissent.

Charles II was restored at the age of thirty. He was tall and swarthy, with great vigour of body, and, though he always disliked taking trouble, with a mind active and powerful too. But the wandering life of a king deprived of his crown had not been favourable to discipline of character. Charles's zeal for chemical experiments and his patronage of the Royal Society, founded in his reign, show a certain interest in intellectual questions. He had also seen much of the world,

The vengeance
of the restored
monarchy.

and brought back to England French manners and a more refined style of living; but with this there was a lower moral tone, which shocked public opinion, even in the days of reaction against Puritan strictness. Though Charles was affable, he was wholly selfish and without tenderness. The restored monarchy stooped to petty malice against its late foes. It dug up the crumbling corpses of Cromwell and others from Westminster Abbey and hung them on a gallows at Tyburn. They were buried at length under the gallows, and Cromwell's dust now lies unrecognised and unmarked beneath the feet of those who pass through Connaught Square in London. By Monk's advice, Charles promised that only those excepted by name from the amnesty should be punished for the late events. Thirteen concerned in the death of Charles I were hanged, drawn, and quartered for treason. Charles himself witnessed some of the executions, which were at Charing Cross, convenient to Whitehall; and upon



SIR HENRY VANE
(1613-1662).

him is the dark stain of having broken faith with men to whom mercy was offered. Sir Henry Vane and General Lambert had been conspicuous opponents of the Stuart monarchy, but they were not regicides, and to them life had been promised. Vane was a man of stainless character and of great courage, but Charles, afraid of his influence, sent him to the block on June 14, 1662. Lambert spent the remaining thirty years of life

in prison, as did many of the regicides, but about twenty were never apprehended. With the hearty approval of the nation, Charles disbanded the army, and Cromwell's soldiers went back to civil life, to win respect by their honest industry. It was said that by none of them were

the ranks of thieves and beggars ever recruited, and that if a workman attracted especial attention by his steady character, he would in all probability be found to have served in the New Model army. Of the finest force in Europe only three regiments were retained.

At Charles's right hand was Edward Hyde, soon to be Earl of Clarendon, a good, but narrow-minded, man, who really ruled England for seven years after the Restoration. He was determined to restore the Church of England to its old privileges

Clarendon's
ministry and
policy.

and supremacy, and to tolerate Protestant non-conformists as little as Roman Catholics. Land's policy was revived. No legislation was necessary to make the Church of England once more the Established Church, for all statutes enacted since the civil war broke out, and to which the king had not given his consent, were invalid. The deprived bishops and clergy returned to their sees and parishes. Of course the union between England, Scotland, and Ire-



EDWARD HYDE, EARL OF
CLARENDON (1609-1674).

land was broken up. So far as necessary these proceedings were sanctioned by the Convention Parliament which restored Charles. But in law it had an incomplete mandate since it was not summoned by royal authority. Early in 1661 there was an election, and the new Parliament sat for no less than eighteen years, until 1679. It was fanatically devoted to the king and the Anglican Church.

Before returning Charles had pledged himself to a tolerant religious policy, at least towards Presbyterianism, but though a conference between the leaders of the Church of England and of the Presbyterians met in the palace of the Savoy

The Savoy
Conference.

in 1661, a conciliatory temper was wanting, and Charles's promise to do something for the Presbyterians was not redeemed. Parliament was eager to destroy every vestige of Cromwell's religious system and by the Corporation Act of 1661 forced all municipal officeholders to take

The Act of Uniformity, 1662. the Anglican sacrament. The Act of Uniformity of 1662 made episcopacy the only recognised form of Church government. By

it the clergy were ordered to declare their assent to everything in the Book of Common Prayer, and to admit that no one might in any circumstances take up arms against the king. Absolutely nothing was offered by way of conciliation, and on St. Bartholomew's Day, August 24, 1662, some two thousand incumbents of English parishes, unwilling to accept the terms of the act, were driven from their places. About five hundred others had already been ejected. They were in most cases reduced to poverty and misery; were forbidden to teach or to preach; and those befriending them were in danger of being suspected as seditious.

The Church policy was Clarendon's, and Charles did not wholly approve of it. He was himself at heart a non-conformist, though not a Protestant.

Charles's Declaration of Indulgence to non-conformists. Before returning to England he appears to have become what is called a crypto-Catholic —one who held that faith but did not publicly profess it.

Naturally he desired to make the position of his co-religionists in England as easy as possible, and in a decree issued on December 26, 1662, he ventured to declare that the laws against non-conformists would not be enforced. This involved the claim that in ecclesiastical matters his authority was superior to that of Parliament. The Lords and Commons took up the challenge, protested against the toleration which Charles proposed, and forced him to choose between yielding or fighting the matter out, as James II did later. He yielded and his Declaration of Indulgence was withdrawn.

The Cavalier party dominant in Parliament still thirst-
 ed to avenge more completely its humiliation and was
 aroused to new action by Charles's attempted
 tolerance. The Conventicle Act of 1664
 aimed at stopping all religious meetings ex-
 cept those of the Anglican Church. If more than five per-
 sons exclusive of the members of a family were present at
 a meeting or "conventicle," each was liable to a fine of £5
 or three months' imprisonment; for the second offence
 the penalty was doubled; for the third it was £150 or
 transportation for seven years, and to return to England
 without leave was punishable with death. By the Five
 Mile Act of 1665 any minister or teacher refusing to
 take an oath of passive obedience to authority was for-
 bidden, under a penalty of £40 for each offence, to come
 within five miles of his former scene of labour or of any
 important town or city. No one might teach, or even re-
 ceive lodgers, who was not ready to say on oath that it was
 unlawful under any circumstances to take up arms against
 the king. Archbishop Sheldon and those acting with him
 appear to have thought that by a few years' rigour non-
 conformity could be destroyed. In 1670 the restrictions
 upon non-conformist meetings were made even more strin-
 gent. The Church authorities paid as high as £15 for in-
 formations concerning non-conformist meetings; they had
 in their service an army of spies by whom the prisons were
 kept full. It was at this time that John Bunyan spent
 many years in Bedford Jail. But religious convictions
 were in reality deepened by the persecutions. Presbyte-
 rian, Independent, and Baptist ministers eluded the law by
 going from house to house and holding meetings too small
 to come under its terms. The Quakers merely defied the
 law. They met and often sat in silence. If ejected they
 quietly came back as soon as they could and sat on with
 open doors. If their meeting-house was destroyed they
 met in the open air. Hundreds were sent to jail, but

The perse-
 cutions by the
 Church party.

the others went on fearlessly, and in the end did much to teach the government that toleration, if not a duty, was a necessity.

Cavaliers who had in some cases lost everything clamoured for their former possessions, but the difficulties in the way of restoration were great. Innocent persons had bought confiscated royalist lands in good faith, and Charles was pledged to as little disturbance of property as possible. In the end he let most of the injured owners do what they could in the courts of law; they said he passed an Act of Indemnity for his enemies and one of Oblivion for his friends. As late as 1681 Parliament voted £60,000 to be distributed among the ruined Cavaliers.

The restored Court was grossly immoral; we may search the utterances of Oliver Cromwell in vain for a single coarse expression, but Charles's talk was indecent and his conduct scandalous. As the reign wore on, Louise de Querouaille, a Frenchwoman sent over by Louis XIV, secured not only the king's personal favour, but an immense influence in the political world, and became Duchess of Portland. To



CHARLES II.

the end of the reign proud English nobles had to pay court to the foreign favourite. But Charles was not a mere profligate. He had a definite political aim from which he never wavered—to rule as he liked. That Parliament should not interfere with him he was resolved. "I care just that for Parliament," he once said, tossing up his handkerchief. But the old free spirit

was not dead, and he learned to care more. The debates in Parliament were, he said, as enjoyable as a play; it

was his habit to stand by the fireplace in the House of Lords listening to them, and there he sometimes heard his own policy denounced in trenchant terms. "My God!" he said, "how I am ill-treated and I must bear it and keep silence." Parliament balked his policy of toleration to Roman Catholics and non-conformists, and refused grants of money except on its own terms. Had Charles been willing to take heavy risks for his convictions he would have brought on the struggle in which his brother James was later overwhelmed, but he loved ease, and, as he said himself, was resolved not again to go on his travels. He did what duplicity and intrigue with foreign powers could effect to make him independent of Parliament. When the nation showed a resolute spirit he bent before the storm, but it is said that in his sleep he would cry out angrily the names of his opponents, and he sent to the scaffold without pity some of the leaders who opposed him.

England and Holland were old commercial rivals, and were sure to fight until one or the other had established its supremacy upon the seas. Against Clarendon's wishes, war was declared in February, 1665. The Parliament supported the king with huge grants of money. There was great excitement, and on June 3, 1665, the English won a bloody victory off Lowestoft. It was at this time that they seized the Dutch colony of New Amsterdam and transformed it into New York. While the war raged plague appeared in London, and before the end of June, 1665, the court hurried from the stricken city. In June 590 died of plague, in July 4,129, in August 20,046, in September 26,230. The bells tolled incessantly, most of the shops were closed, grass grew in the streets, the river was deserted. And in 1666, when London was recovering itself, came a new and overwhelming misfortune. Fire broke out on September 2 and for some days swept unchecked through the most

War with
Holland, plague
and fire.



THE GREAT FIRE OF LONDON, 1666.

crowded districts of the city. Two-thirds of London lay in ruins. Charles was impressed by the accumulated disasters, and the tone of the court became for a time serious.

But France now joined Holland in the war, and while England needed to husband every resource Charles was wasting in profligacy the money voted for arms. He allowed the larger ships of the navy to go out of commission, left the Thames defenceless, and gave the Dutch an opening for a heavy blow. Ruyter and DeWitt sailed up the Thames and the Medway in June, 1667, burned what shipping they could, and caused a fearful panic in London itself.

The fall of
Clarendon.



FLEEING FROM THE PLAGUE.

Though by blockading the Thames they brought on a coal famine, they withdrew without attacking the city. England's rage on account of the mismanagement of the war turned against one who was not responsible for it. The mob attacked Clarendon's new palace in Piccadilly, and the king, not unwilling to sacrifice an austere minister of whom he was tired, dismissed him from office. To avoid impeachment he fled from England. The Parliament banished him for life, and he spent his remaining years in writing the history of the great era in which he himself had played an important part.

Charles now sank into deeper moral guilt. He desired to join openly the Roman Church, yet he was obliged from time to time to assert publicly his devotion to the

Church of England. Parliament steadily resisted every attempt to override its authority, and was acutely suspi-

Charles's
subservience
to France.

cious of the designs

of France. Yet in

1670, by the secret Treaty of Dover, Charles allied himself with Louis XIV, who meanwhile was to pay him a large income, and was to support him with a French army if his subjects rebelled when he declared himself a Roman Catholic and reconciled England to the Roman Church. The King of England became in fact a pensioner of France. Charles surrounded

himself with men whom he thought he could use—with Buckingham, the dissolute son of Charles I's favourite; with Anthony Ashley Cooper, soon created Earl of Shaftesbury; with Clifford and Arlington. But they were in



ANTHONY ASHLEY COOPER,
EARL OF SHAFTESBURY
(1621-1683).



LOUIS XIV OF FRANCE
(1638-1715).

no sense like a modern cabinet, and only one or two of them knew of the intrigue with France. The ablest among them was undoubtedly Shaftesbury, who became Lord Chancellor. He was unscrupulous, but, compared with others of the time, his life was pure; two principles dominated his conduct—he favoured religious toleration, and he urged strongly the rights of Parliament. Yet he lent himself to Charles's plans, worked against Holland in the interests of

France, and, though peace was made in 1667, helped to bring about renewed war. England and France united

in 1672 to attack Holland, and soon the heroic Dutch, under William of Orange (in time to be William III of England), had to open their dikes and flood their country to keep back the armies of Louis XIV.

But in England distrust of Charles's policy was ripening. To carry out his pledge to Louis to restore Roman

Catholicism, he issued, in 1672, a new Declaration of Indulgence, setting aside anew the laws coercing non-conformists; but the storm

**The Test Act,
1673.**

of opposition forced him again to retreat, and Parliament, now aroused, passed the Test Act, which obliged every officeholder to repudiate transubstantiation and to take the sacrament in accordance with the rites of the Church of England. It was a strange situation that compelled a king, at heart a Roman Catholic, to consent to such an act, but Parliament would grant no money until it became law. One of its first consequences was that Charles's own brother, James, Duke of York, who in the previous year took the bold step of avowing himself a convert to Roman Catholicism, was forced to resign all his offices and to leave England.

On November 9, 1673, Charles dismissed Shaftesbury from office because of his support of the Test Act, and

**The persecution
of Roman
Catholics.**

henceforth found him the most resolute opponent of the royal policy. The nation hated the alliance with France, and in 1674 obliged Charles to conclude a separate peace with Holland. Already the truth about the discreditable Treaty of Dover was known; it drove the English nation to the opposite extreme, and a wild outburst of fanaticism was in time provoked by Charles's plan to use the power of France to re-establish Roman Catholicism in England. Titus Oates, a disreputable man, who had obtained orders in the Church of England, told on oath, in September, 1678, a circumstantial story that, feigning to be a convert, he had learned the secrets of the Jesuits; that a reward of £26,000 had

been made up for the persons who should murder the king; that prominent leaders in England were also to be murdered, and that with the aid of a French army James was to be made king, and the Jesuits were to become supreme in the land. A few days later, Sir Edmund



WILLIAM HOWARD, VISCOUNT
STAFFORD (1612-1680).

Berry Godfrey, the magistrate before whom Oates made his deposition, was murdered, possibly by Oates himself to create a further sensation. Even moderate and liberal-minded men like William, Lord Russell, were carried away by the fury of suspicion. No statement was too grotesque to be believed. It was whispered that the Roman Catholics—a small minority in England—were about to burn London and to murder all good Protestants. Both the Commons and the Lords asserted their belief in the plot, and November 13 was declared a fast-day. The panic of fear lasted about two years. Leading Roman Catholics were thrown into the Tower. Lord Stafford, a Roman Catholic peer, was kept in prison two years, and then, after a scandalous trial by the Lords, he was sent to the block, though entirely innocent of what was charged against him. On Oates's testimony thirty-five men in all were executed. There was talk of making him a bishop. Fear of France was perhaps at the root of all the bitter injustice aroused by the impostor.

The Parliament could not reach the king, who was the ringleader in the plot with France, but it impeached his minister, Thomas Osborne, Earl of Danby, and afterward Duke of Leeds. There was danger of scandalous exposures, and Charles dissolved the eighteen-year-old Parliament in the hope of

The struggle
between king
and Parliament.

getting a more friendly assembly. But the new House was hostile, and, to save its members from being kept in prison by the angry king, it passed in 1679 the Habeas Corpus Act, requiring that accused persons should be tried immediately or liberated, and imposing heavy penalties upon any judge who should disregard the terms of the act. The Parliament attempted to exclude the Duke of York, as a Roman Catholic, from the succession to the throne, and Shaftesbury now urged that the Duke of Monmouth, the eldest illegitimate son of Charles, should be made heir, on the basis of a trumped-up story of his legitimacy through Charles's marriage with his mother—a story promptly denied by the king. Charles dissolved Parliament three times; party spirit ran high, and Whigs and Tories now appear; a Tory was a lawless Irish rebel, and the party of the Duke of York was given this name in derision: the Tories retorted by calling their opponents Whigs, after some fanatical Scottish sectaries who rejected all law but that given to the people of Israel. Feeling was so bitter that renewed civil war seemed imminent.



JAMES SCOTT, DUKE OF
MONMOUTH (1649-1685).

The nation took alarm at the menace, and when Charles called no Parliament during the last four years of his reign, he probably had public opinion behind him. For a time he kept Shaftesbury in the Tower on the charge of high treason. On his release the earl fled to Holland, where he soon died. Charles cancelled the charter of London and of other places, and put their affairs in the hands of his own Tory nominees. He released Danby from prison without trial. In order to save the nation's liberties, some of the Whigs,

The Tory
reaction.

on the other hand, planned to seize and even murder the king and the Duke of York ; but this "Rye House Plot," so called from the place of meeting, was discovered, and the king's hand fell heavily upon those involved in it. The son of the Earl of Bedford, William, Lord Russell, a man of high character, was involved, though apparently he was no party to the darker features of the plot, and Charles sent him to the block—a martyr to the right to resist



THE RYE HOUSE.

royal tyranny. Algernon Sydney, another of the Whig leaders, was also executed ; Lord Essex committed suicide to avoid a similar fate, and Charles banished to Holland

Monmouth, who had acted with some of the plotters. The Tory reaction prevailed everywhere, but in the moment of his triumph Charles was struck down by a mortal illness. On his death-bed he no longer concealed his real opinions; he was reconciled to the Roman Church, and died a member of that communion, February 6, 1685. As the law then stood, Father Huddleston, the priest who received him, had committed a crime for which the penalty was death.



WILLIAM, LORD RUSSELL
(1639-1683).

It might well have seemed at the moment of Charles's death that time had brought its vindication of Charles I. No Parliament had met for nearly four years. Everywhere the clergy of the Anglican Church were preaching that on no ground might arms be taken up against the king. The machinery of government was in his hands, and the nation was apparently not restive. All this was changed. James II was the first Roman Catholic sovereign of England since Philip and Mary, and, like Mary, he was a religious enthusiast. For more than a century the celebration of mass had been illegal in England, but, with the law still unchanged, James attended a public mass in great state. One of his earliest acts was to press on proceedings against Titus Oates, who was convicted of perjury and flogged with such severity, in May, 1685, that it amounted almost to flaying alive. Yet he recovered, and lived to receive a handsome pension under William III. James was resolved not only to undo past injustice but to re-establish Roman Catholicism by the use of royal authority. He had the unwavering Stuart belief that the king was above the laws and might suspend them.

The aims of
James II, 1685.

At once James was called to defend his throne by force of arms. The young Duke of Monmouth, exiled by his father, Charles II, claimed to be the lawful king. He landed, on June 11, with a few adventurous followers at Lyme, in Dorsetshire; at Taunton, on June 20, he assumed the title of king, denounced James as a usurper, and set a price upon his head. In Scotland the Earl of Argyle led a similar revolt, but both leaders were doomed to failure. Monmouth called himself the champion of Protestantism. Some thousands of peasants joined him, but their natural leaders held aloof as a whole, and at Sedgemoor, near Bridgewater, on July 6, his force was cut to pieces. Nine days



GEORGE, BARON JEFFREYS
(1648-1689).

later he paid on the scaffold the last penalty of his treason. Judge Jeffreys, instructed, as he afterward claimed, by James, went down to the rebel district and held what is known as the Bloody Assize. He was a man of intemperate habits and unbridled speech, and some of the trials were travesties of justice. Jeffreys sent to the scaffold two or three hundred persons, and granted to courtiers some eight hundred others

to be sold for the new owners' profit as slave labourers in the colonies. The severity of Jeffreys was pleasing to James, who rewarded him with the high prize of the Lord Chancellorship.

Parliament gave whole-hearted support to James in resisting Monmouth, and he now thought that, in all circumstances, the nation would support the kingly power as the safeguard of order. He was strong and energetic physically, and, though profligate, was sober; he did not

gamble, and possessed industry and resolution. There were indeed some attractive qualities in this last of the

James's
attempts to re-
establish Roman
Catholicism.

Stuart kings. He was a tender father; he was always true to his friends, and his servants loved him. But he was blindly obstinate and without tact. He began by levying taxes illegally. Then, in defiance of the Test Act, he appointed Roman Catholics to the Privy Council and to posts in the army. When his only Parliament met for its second and last session and protested against these breaches of the law, he angrily dismissed it, in November, 1685, and henceforth ruled without it. He brought over Roman Catholic regiments from Ireland, and formed a camp on Hounslow Heath; nothing disturbed the English more than this menace of the Irish, whom they looked upon as savages. He disarmed the Protestants in Ireland, dismissed the Protestant Lord-Lieutenant, Clarendon, the son of Charles II's minister and his own brother-in-law, and appointed in his place a Roman Catholic, Richard Talbot, whom he made Earl of Tyrconnell. He drove from office the Marquis of Halifax, the keenest intellect among the statesmen of the time, the Earl of Rochester, younger brother of Clarendon, and many others, because they would not change their faith or do his will. Judges who lent themselves to his plans were promoted. Though fanatically loyal, the Anglican clergy were thoroughly Protestant in tone; James forbade them to attack Roman Catholic doctrine, and one of them who disobeyed was publicly whipped. He allowed clergymen who joined the Church of Rome to retain their Anglican benefices. He placed University College and



JAMES II.

Christ Church, Oxford, under Roman Catholic heads. When the post of president of Magdalen College became vacant, he nominated a Roman Catholic, Anthony Farmer, and expelled the fellows who refused to accept him. For refusing to confer a degree upon a Roman Catholic he dismissed from office Peachell, the Vice-Chancellor of Cambridge University, and Jeffreys answered a protesting deputation with the words "Go your way and sin no more lest a worse thing happen to you."

Already great was the alarm of Protestant England when in April, 1687, James issued a Declaration of Indulgence which set aside several acts of Parliament. There were to be no religious tests from persons holding office, and no restrictions upon the public worship of those who differed from the Church of England. Time has brought into effect in England what James thus decreed, and it is not hard

The Declaration of Indulgence and trial of the seven bishops.



WILLIAM PENN (1644-1718).
The founder of Pennsylvania.

to see why some Protestant non-conformists were ready to support his policy. The "Quakers" had always taught that the state ought never to meddle with any one's religion, and their leader, William Penn, who was in James's confidence, worked hard for the policy of toleration; but the Protestant dissenters as a rule opposed all indulgence to Roman Catholics. For nearly a century and a half no ambassador of the Pope had

been recognised in England, but James received with great ceremonial the papal nuncio at Whitehall. He made Petre, his own Jesuit confessor, a member of the Privy Council. Even the Pope warned him that he was

going too fast. In the autumn of 1687 he made a progress through the country, and had he possessed discrimination, he could have seen danger in the coldness with



THE SEVEN BISHOPS GOING TO THE TOWER.

which he was received. But signs of opposition made James only the more resolute, and in April, 1688, he ordered the Anglican clergy to read the Declaration of Indulgence in their churches on two successive Sundays. Sancroft, Archbishop of Canterbury, with six other bishops presented to him a petition which was really a refusal to obey the order, and in only a few cases was the declaration read. In a rage, James threw the seven bishops into the Tower, and had them tried for seditious libel in presenting their petition. There was intense interest in the case, and when, on June 30, 1688, a verdict of acquittal was given, it was received with outbursts of joy, which ought to have revealed to James his danger. As the king had no male heir, the nation expected that one of his Protestant daughters, Mary or Anne, should succeed him, but just at the time when excitement was high over the trial of the bishops, James's queen bore him a son. The birth

of this young prince, who would be reared a Roman Catholic, destroyed this hope of a Protestant succession and intensified Protestant alarm. Keen was the suspicion of James's designs, and it was generally believed, but without foundation, that the infant was not really the son of the queen.

England was now ripe for revolution. On the very day of the acquittal of the seven bishops, leading English statesmen joined in sending an invitation to William of Orange to save England. William was the husband of James's eldest daughter, and, like her, a grandchild of Charles I; and he had become the leader of Europe against the designs of James's ally,

The coming
of William of
Orange.



EMBARKATION OF WILLIAM OF ORANGE AT HELVOETSLUYS.

Louis XIV of France. On September 30, 1688, William issued a public declaration to the people of England that he was coming to champion their rights and to insure the holding of a free Parliament. His preparations were extensive. About 500 ships, carrying a force of 14,000 men, left the shores of Holland; they sailed down the Channel in magnificent array, and, on November 5, William landed at Torbay, in Devonshire. It looked as if England was


once more to see civil war; but the nation had lost confidence in James, and few would fight for him. At last, but when it was too late, he made concessions. As William slowly advanced towards London, James's followers, including even his own daughter Anne, slipped away, and he was in fear for his own life. His mind turned to France, with whose aid he felt sure of re-establishing his power, and sending the queen and her infant son thither, he prepared to follow them. On December 11 he tried to fly in disguise, but, by some over-officiousness on the part of friends of William, was discovered and brought back to London. William soon occupied the capital without opposition, and he ordered James to retire to Rochester. Then the fallen king succeeded in doing precisely what William wished—he escaped to France.

SUMMARY OF DATES

The restoration of 1660 was followed in **1661** by the **Savoy Conference**. The **Corporation Act of 1661** made allegiance to the Church of England the condition of holding municipal office. The **Act of Uniformity of May, 1662**, compelled many ministers who would not take the required oaths to resign their benefices. The **Conventicle Act of 1664** and the **Five Mile Act of 1665** completed the narrow restrictions upon non-conformists. England seized New York from Holland in 1664 without waiting for a formal declaration of war. The Great Plague of London was in 1665, and the Great Fire in 1666. The **Secret Treaty of Dover in 1670** made Charles II a pensioner of France. Parliament passed in **1673** the **Test Act** enforcing conformity to the Church of England and a declaration against transubstantiation from all officeholders. The so-called "**Popish Plot**" fabricated by Titus Oates was in **1678**. The **Habeas Corpus Act** became law in **1679**. The **Rye House Plot of 1683** led to the execution of Lord Russell and Algernon Sydney. James II succeeded in 1685. **Monmouth's Insurrection** took place in the same year (Battle of Sedgemoor). James issued his **Declaration of Indulgence** in **1687**. The trial and acquittal of the seven bishops took place in June, **1688**. William of Orange landed in England in November, and James fled in December.

BOOKS FOR REFERENCE

* Macaulay, History of England (5 vols., many editions); Diary of S. Pepys, edited by Wheatley (5 vols., 1897); Evelyn's Diary (new edition, 1895); Defoe, History of the Plague in London, 1665 (many reprints); Christie, A Life of the First Earl of Shaftesbury (2 vols., 1871).

THE GENEALOGIES OF THE HOUSES OF ORANGE
AND HANOVER

CHAPTER XVII

From the English Revolution to the Close of the Seven Years' War

(1689-1763—74 years)

{ William III	born 1650; succeeded 1689; died 1702.
{ Mary II	" 1662; " 1689; " 1694.
Anne	" 1665; " 1702; " 1714.
George I	" 1660; " 1714; " 1727.
George II	" 1683; " 1727; " 1760.
George III	" 1738; " 1760; " 1820.

[Under William III England became the organizing centre against Louis XIV's ambitions in Europe. Her old antagonists, Spain and Holland, now took a secondary place, and she engaged in a prolonged struggle with France, their successor in rivalry. The Peace of Utrecht, in 1713, marked the decline of France's power. After that, though still in Asia and America she disputed the leadership with Britain, her navy was neglected; as a result, in the great struggle of the Seven Years' War, which ended in 1763, Britain was able by her naval power to destroy the over-sea influence of France, who lost practically all of her colonial possessions. During the period northern Europe played a greater part in continental affairs than ever before. Peter the Great (d. 1725) brought Russia into touch with Western life, and Frederick the Great (d. 1786) made Prussia a leading European power, and paved the way for her modern supremacy in Germany. Issues about religion had ceased to play the chief part in the political world. The great Englishman, Sir Isaac Newton (d. 1727), carried on and matured the work of earlier observers in regard to the laws of Nature, and helped to create the enthusiasm for physical science that marked the middle of the eighteenth century, and weakened the hold of religious dogma. David Hume (d. 1776) was only one of many writers who entirely rejected the Christian faith. Voltaire (d. 1778) attacked the Church with caustic wit, and fostered an anti-clerical spirit that resulted in the overthrow of the Jesuit order soon after the close of the period.]


IN the moment of success, William of Orange showed every respect for English traditions. While not yet king he could not summon a legal Parliament, but he called a Convention, a Parliament in everything but the name. Many doubted whether a king could be deposed, but facts had shattered the theory of divine right, and in the end William and Mary were made joint sovereigns, with the regal power in William's hands: the survivor, who proved to be William, was to reign alone. Even under Charles II Parliament had, in times of crisis, proved stronger than the king, and there could hardly again be any doubt that it controlled the throne. The Convention drew up a Declaration of Rights, which in 1689 became a legally enacted Bill of Rights, and asserted in uncompromising terms the liberties claimed by the nation. The crown now definitely agreed that no taxes should be levied, no standing army kept in time of peace, without the consent of Parliament; that the king could not suspend the laws; that subjects might freely petition the crown; that elections should be free; that no one should suffer from illegal penalties. Though William cared little for the rights of the English nation, he wished to use England's power in his great design of checking France, and he yielded what was asked.

In Scotland and in Ireland, if not in England, the Revolution brought bloodshed. Scotland had a long roll of grievances against the Stuart kings. All the five sovereigns since Protestantism was accepted in 1560 had successively opposed Scottish Presbyterianism. The Stuart Restoration, which re-established Scotland as an independent kingdom, involved commercial loss to the smaller state, for it destroyed the free trade with England upon which the Scottish farmer had come to rely for a market. By it religious strife was also intensified. Because he had the power of England behind him, Charles II ruled Scotland as a despot; past

The terms of
the Revolution.

The religious
struggle in
Scotland.

failure brought no change of method, and episcopacy was still to be the form of Church government of a people who abhorred it. There followed a bloody chapter of strife, which lasted through the greater part of Charles II's and James II's reigns. The Marquis of Argyle, and three other leaders on the Presbyterian side, were executed in 1661 for their share in Cromwell's work; the Presbyterian ministers who would not accept the authority of the bishops were driven from their posts, and forbidden



BANNER CARRIED INTO BATTLE IN 1679 BY SOME OF THE MORE EXTREME COVENANTERS.

The Hebrew is "Yahweh-Nissi," "Jehovah is my banner" (Ex. xvii, 16).

to teach the people, or to go within twenty miles of their former parishes; parishioners who stayed away from the churches where the new ministers officiated were imprisoned, or if they had property, were heavily fined, and soldiers were sometimes quartered in their houses. Of course, these proceedings made opposition in many cases only more determined. The "Covenanters," who refused obedience to any but a Presbyterian king, held their meetings on moors and hillsides, in glens and secret places, and sometimes met the violence of the Government in

kind. In 1679, Sharpe, Archbishop of St. Andrews, the head of Scottish episcopacy, was murdered on Magus Muir. Charles's agents, in turn, used torture and execution; they punished the Pentland rising and other appeals to arms with merciless severity. Though a free Assembly and a free Parliament would at any time have restored Presbyterianism, the work of repression went on for the whole of Charles II's reign, and Scotland was coerced in defiance of the wishes of a majority of its people. When James succeeded he refused to obey the law by taking the usual oath to defend the Protestant religion, and the Earl



JOHN GRAHAM OF CLAVERHOUSE,
VISCOUNT DUNDEE
(1649 ?-1689).

of Argyle, son of the marquis executed under Charles II, led a Protestant attack on James in Scotland as Monmouth did in England. He failed, and perished on the scaffold in 1685.

But Scotland, more Protestant even than England, soon turned against James's policy. When William landed, a free Parliament at last met, and Scotland spoke its mind. It accepted William and Mary as sovereigns, and made Presbyterianism the state religion, a de-

cision that has remained in force until this day. But the elements to oppose William were stronger in Scotland than in England. The Episcopalians, the

The revolution
in Scotland.

Roman Catholic Highlanders, and those loyal to the ancient Scottish line, were a powerful minority. James's leader in Scotland, Graham of Claverhouse, Viscount Dundee, gathering an army of Highlanders, met William's forces at Killiecrankie, and gained a victory dearly bought by his own death. In spite of this defeat, William's cause gained steadily. The Presbyterian

ministers, the natural leaders of the parishes, were heartily in favour of the king: the "Cameronians," the most resolute of the Covenanters, were organized into a regiment, and opposition was soon confined to the remote Highlands. There William's ministers made a terrible error. They named a date by which the clans must give in their adhesion to the Revolution government, and, on the plea that the Macdonalds of Glencoe had not yielded in time, they were treacherously massacred in February, 1692. William himself sanctioned the act, which was intended to terrify his foes, but it greatly helped James's cause by perpetuating a bitter sense of injury. Strong garrisons were necessary to restrain the Highlands, and more than half a century later the clansmen were still ready to rise for the Stuart claimant.

In Ireland, James's zeal for Roman Catholicism had aroused, not dislike, but enthusiasm. He landed there within three months of his flight from London, and was aided by French troops and generals. The Irish Parliament, in this turn of affairs composed almost entirely of Roman Catholics, met at Dublin in May, 1689, and proceeded in a wholesale way to redistribute to Roman Catholic proprietors the land occupied by the Cromwellian settlers, and to confiscate the estates of the English colonists who supported William. But the Stuart cause was really hopeless: there was no unity of plan between the Irish and their allies, and disaster came quickly. Tyrconnell, the Lord Deputy, a man of disreputable character, raised for James a force of 100,000 men, but it showed little discipline, and when the Protestants of Ulster threw themselves into Londonderry James could not dislodge them. After a famous siege William's forces relieved the place on July 30, 1689, and in the following year William himself landed in Ireland. In the battle of the Boyne, July 1, 1690, he met his father-in-law in the field for the first and last

The revolution
in Ireland.

time. The defeated James fled in a panic to France, leaving his general, Sarsfield, to command in Ireland. The lost cause made a heroic defence of Limerick, but in the end was forced to yield. By the Pacification of Limerick, October 3, 1691, William gave the Irish soldiers the choice of enlisting under him, or of going into exile. Nearly all chose exile, and left behind thousands of destitute wives and children. Triumphant Protestantism then worked its will in Ireland. Those who had sided with James were promised the liberties enjoyed under Charles II, on condition of taking the oath of allegiance to William, but those who refused these terms forfeited their estates; Roman Catholics lost all political rights, and the desolate country settled down to a century of oppression, the details of which it is hard now to credit.

In 1692 Louis XIV made a last effort to help the unhappy James, and gathered a great fleet at La Hogue, for the invasion of England. The English and the Dutch attacked it, and James himself watched the struggle from the shore: it was his last hope, and the issue was not less critical than when Philip's Armada threatened England. The French lost the day. James went back to the palace of St. Germain, in which Louis had lodged him, and he soon abandoned all thought of a restoration, though his followers did not. His last years showed the sincerity of his faith. In renunciation of the world's vanities he fulfilled a round of austerities, and he thanked God that he had been willing to give up an earthly for a heavenly crown. To the last he exhorted his heir never to sacrifice his Catholic faith to gain the English throne.

With the success of La Hogue, William and Mary were secure on the throne. They are in vivid contrast. He was small, reserved, and sickly; she, large, voluble, full of animation. "The king thinks all, the queen says all, the Parliament does all," said a contemporary witticism.

Final defeat at
La Hogue of
James's cause.

Mary was devoted to the Church of England, and William left the crown's patronage in Church affairs largely to her.

William's character and religious policy. While she gave him a tender affection, he treated her harshly, and was far from being a pattern in morals. His hold upon his new subjects was slight. He was not an Englishman, nor a Churchman; he lacked sympathy with either of the great political parties, and he had no qualities to win the applause of the masses. He made intimate friends of Dutchmen only, and hardly concealed his preference for Holland over England. Yet it was this pale and haggard man, with cold and unsympathetic manners, worn with asthma and almost an invalid, unpopular at home, threatened abroad by the most formidable military power Christian Europe had yet seen, who piloted England through a terrible crisis. He tried to make the Church of England comprehensive enough to include Presbyterians and Independents, and found support from Tillotson, Archbishop of Canterbury, Burnet, his wife's chaplain, who became Bishop of Salisbury, and from a few others; but the great mass of both Anglicans and dissenters abhorred comprehension that involved compromise, and the scheme failed. A Toleration Act (1689) gave liberty of worship to all but Unitarians and Roman Catholics, and even these were not molested; but officeholders were still required to make a declaration against transubstantiation, and to receive the communion in the Church of England. William's proposal to abolish these tests lost him, it was said, 80,000 supporters in London. Civil officials and the clergy were required in addition to take the oaths of supremacy and of allegiance to William and Mary. From this some hundreds of the Anglican clergy, headed by Sancroft, Archbishop of Canterbury, and other bishops, drew back, holding that the Church was independent, and that Parliament had no right to prescribe oaths for the clergy. They would not yield, and had to give up their positions,

and the body of the Non-jurors, which they formed, long survived.

William had the great aim of checking France in Europe, and for this the power of England was necessary.

Party He was not a great soldier. The brilliant
government Luxembourg defeated him at Steinkirk in
under William. 1692 and at Landen in 1693. But in the end
he was the real victor, for in 1697 France, by the Treaty of Ryswick, was forced to recognise his title as King of England, and to give up her conquests during the war. William spent his summers in campaigning, his winters in managing Parliament, and perhaps the latter was the more formidable task. The Whigs and the Tories were now engaged in the struggle for party supremacy which has ever since marked English political life. The violence of faction astounded William, but he learned to use parties, and at last to choose his ministers almost wholly from the side that was strongest in the House of Commons. From 1693 to 1699 England was ruled by a small group of Whig statesmen, known as the "Junto," who discharged the functions of a modern cabinet. Somers was Lord Chancellor, Montague was in charge of finance, Russell of the navy, and the skilful but disreputable Wharton was political manager. William kept foreign affairs in his own hands. The House of Commons had been accustomed to vote Tory or Whig from day to day according to the majority present, and an adverse vote hardly affected public policy. Now the Junto organized their party for steady support. By controlling the House of Commons they controlled the government and William found in them his political masters.

Former Parliaments had given the king a revenue for life, but William was granted £700,000 a year for four years only, and had to give an account of the spending of the money. His wars caused further heavy demands. Cromwell had strained England's financial power by spend-

ing £2,000,000 in a single year on army and navy. William received in one year £5,000,000, and in addition he piled up huge deficits aggregating during his reign £20,000,000. Such enormous claims could not be met out of ordinary revenues ; the nation was obliged to give its promise to pay, and under William the national debt began. As yet there was no bank in England. The Dutch Republic had a bank, but it was feared that under a monarch a bank would not be safe, since the king might lay a robber hand upon it. William Paterson, a Scot, has the credit of suggesting the founding of a Bank of England, and in 1694 that great institution came into being. It lent the government £1,200,000 at 8 per cent, and the moneyed classes, who were chiefly Whigs, showed their confidence in the scheme by furnishing the necessary capital. Indeed, the bank served the deep political purpose of pledging capital to the support of William's government. Such debts, it was certain, James would repudiate.

In 1694 Parliament made William consent to the Triennial Bill, requiring a new general election at least every third year. The aim was to keep a king from prolonging unduly the life of a friendly Parliament. It was after the Peace of Ryswick in 1697 that Parliament used its power most decisively. As a safeguard of peace, William wished to keep a considerable army, but he could not quiet the English fear of military rule. Parliament reduced the army to 10,000 men, and insisted further that the Dutch, Irish, and Scottish soldiers, who had fought in William's wars, should be dismissed and only the English kept. William's bitter comment was that what Louis, by eight years of war, could not effect to overthrow the military power of England, Parliament did at a blow, and he threatened to abdicate. But the Parliament was obdurate, and went so far as to annul grants of land in Ireland which William had made to his

Financial
matters.

William's
dispute with
Parliament.

Dutch friends—Bentinck, Earl of Portland, Keppel, Earl of Albemarle, and others.

With the Treaty of Ryswick in 1697 it seemed as if Europe would for a time have peace. The hope was vain.

When Charles II, King of Spain, died childless in 1700 Louis XIV, in spite of former pledges, put his own grandson, Philip, Duke of Anjou, on the vacant throne. When James II died soon after, Louis promptly recognised James's son as King of England. It was a reckless defiance to William; the nation was stirred to its depths, and Whig and Tory for the time forgot their differences. Parliament voted William 40,000 soldiers and 40,000 sailors, and by a Bill of Attainder it made Louis's nominee to the throne guilty of high treason. But before war broke out William was no more. On February 20, 1702, he fell from his horse, broke his collarbone, and injured one of his lungs. Though there was no alarm for a time, he died on March 8. When Mary died in 1694, deep had been the national sorrow, but William was little regretted. Though he was the best ruler of England since the days of Elizabeth, the nation, with its severe insularity, could never forgive him for being a foreigner. He saved it from the power of France, checked religious strife, and promoted great reforms. His minister, Montague, readjusted the coinage in 1696, and by the use of the milled edge prevented the clipping which made the old coins always of uncertain value. The old narrow censorship of the press came to an end in 1695, and liberty once more justified itself: the tone of the books and the newspapers under the free system proved immeasurably higher and better than in the days of restriction.

Anne, daughter of James II, succeeded William. Though a pure and good woman she was ill-qualified by nature for her arduous post. She was surrounded by bitter factions, the horizon was clouded with war, and

her narrow intellect and judgment could not grapple with so difficult a situation. Like all the sovereigns

The rule of Anne.

of the Stuart house, with the exception of Charles II, she was deeply and sincerely religious; "Queen Anne's Bounty," consisting of Church revenues appropriated by Henry VIII and restored by Anne, is to this day a memorial of her thought for the clergy of the Church of England, to which she was devoted. She herself nominated some of the bishops, and always refused to give this promotion to Swift because she doubted the sincerity of his religious professions. Her desire for the welfare of her people won the love of her subjects, who called her "The Good Queen Anne," and as a Stuart she seemed to have the sanction of legitimacy. The superstition that the royal touch would heal the scrofulous complaint known as the "King's Evil" had declined under the usurper William, who once touched a suppliant with the scornful prayer that God would both heal him and give him more wisdom; but a service for the ceremony was now printed in the Prayer Book, and the time of performance of the miracle was solemnly announced by proclamation of the Privy Council. Eye-witnesses report many wonderful cures.

Incessant war made Anne's a blood-stained reign. The long-threatened strife broke out in 1702 and lasted for eleven years. England's armies were led by

The career of Marlborough.

John Churchill, Duke of Marlborough, a greater soldier than William, but a man whose love of money led him into many a shabby and treacherous deed. Yet he had noble qualities. While success spoiled Napoleon and made him rash, ten years of splendid achievements left Marlborough still a prudent, fearless, courteous leader, who shone as much on the field of diplomacy as on that of battle. There was a European league to check Louis XIV, and English, Dutch, Austrian, Prussian, Danish, and Hanoverian soldiers

made up the motley ranks of Marlborough's forces. His first great victory was won in 1704 at Blenheim, on the upper Danube, and perhaps it saved England



JOHN CHURCHILL, DUKE OF MARLBOROUGH (1650-1722).

from the yoke of the Stuart Pretender, whom a French success might have put on the throne. About the same time the English captured Gibraltar, which they still hold. Madrid was occupied by the allies, and Stanhope took Minorca in 1708. Marlborough was mainly occupied near the northern frontier of France and he prepared to march on Paris by the very route that the Germans took in 1870.

The victory of Ramillies in 1706, of Oudenarde in 1708, of Malplaquet in 1709, followed in brilliant succession. Marlborough and his great ally, Prince Eugene of Savoy, reached the very summit of military glory, but it was sanguinary work. At Malplaquet 20,000 of Marlborough's men were slaughtered before he drove back with half this loss the starving French troops who barred his way to Paris, and he prayed that never again might he see the carnage of battle. It proved, indeed, his last great victory.

Marlborough led England's armies, and his duchess, Sarah, led England's queen. This ambitious and imperious woman long ruled Anne, who, though not entirely weak in character, seems to have found some such intimate a necessity. Though forced by his position to take an active part in politics, the duke himself had no real attachment for either political party. His chief ally was Godolphin, a statesman of great financial genius. The Whigs were the war party; the

Domestic
affairs.

Tories, whose leanings to James II's son made them look hopefully on Louis XIV, were for peace with France. Beginning with Tories, Marlborough had gradually to introduce Whigs into the ministry, and with that party his fortunes were in the end linked. Successful war was not the only achievement of the period of Marlborough's supremacy. The year 1706 has the name of "Wonderful" in English history. It saw a great vic-

The union
with Scotland.

tory of peace. Then, after much bitter controversy, Scotland and England agreed to join together to form the United Kingdom of Great Britain, and the union passed the English Parliament and came into effect in the following year, 1707. Henceforth there was to be but one Parliament; forty-five members from Scotland were to sit in the House of Commons, and sixteen of the peers of Scotland in the House of Lords. Since her king had ruled England too, Scotland found that she was really tied to English policy. She had tried to build up independent colonies and trade, but her colony at Darien failed disastrously, and her trade was hampered because she had not free access to the markets of her great neighbour. The union brought, of course, free trade with England, and henceforth Scots went freely to the English colonies. Necessary as the union was, it is almost a surprise that, amid the factions of the time, so enlightened a measure should find acceptance. The Whigs glorified the Revolution, approved of recent concessions to dissenters, and desired more; and since all of the six children of Anne's marriage with Prince George of Denmark had died, they looked to the German House of Hanover to succeed Anne, as arranged by Parliament. On the other hand, the Tories were for keeping all dissenters out of office, for depriving them of any right to teach the youth of the country, and many Tories desired to make James II's son king in succession to Anne. In 1710 one Dr. Sacheverell preached in St. Paul's Cathedral

a sermon supporting non-resistance to kingly authority and also persecution of dissenters, and in effect impeaching the whole Revolution settlement. Sacheverell was a noisy controversialist best answered by silence; the wise Somers advised the Whig ministry to leave him alone, but, eager to justify the Revolution, they gave Sacheverell the undue importance of an impeachment. In the dramatic trial which followed he became a popular hero; from thousands of pulpits the cry went out that the Church was in danger. We hear much now of High and Low Church, and the London mob was all for "High Church and Sacheverell." The queen herself espoused his cause. Though he was formally condemned, the agitation showed that the Whig doctrines were unpopular. In 1711 even the Whig leaders abandoned the dissenters and helped to pass the Occasional Conformity Bill, by which any one in office who attended a dissenting place of worship was to be dismissed, and incapable of public employment for a year after he had ceased such attendance. Few dissenters, however, retired from office; some evaded the law by having chaplains in their own houses, so that they should not feel obliged to attend a dissenting place of worship; and a good many former Presbyterians now became regular members of the Church of England, and swelled the ranks of the Low Church party.

The Tory
reaction.

At length Anne grew weary of the domineering ways of the Duchess of Marlborough. To the duchess's chagrin, the queen and Mrs. Masham, a lady of the bedchamber, became intimate, and when the duchess broke out in stormy jealousy, there was a quarrel which proved of political importance. The queen now turned to Harley, the leader of the Tory party, against Marlborough and the Whigs. There was much petticoat intrigue, in which Mrs. Masham played a leading part; finally, even the great duke was dismissed

The overthrow
of the Whigs,
1711.

from his post in the army and forced into exile, and the Tories were triumphant. The Whigs had wanted the war which still raged and had refused even favourable terms of peace, but now the Tories were resolved to end the contest. They had a majority in the House of Commons, and gained control of the Whig House of Lords by persuading the queen to create twelve new Tory peers, a step of deep moment, for it involved that the Lords henceforth must in some way be forced to follow the lead of the Commons. The Tories made peace, but at the sacrifice of honour. Ormonde, who succeeded Marlborough, entered into treacherous negotiations with the French in the field, and deserted the allies at a critical period of the war. England herself fared well enough. The peace of Utrecht, signed on March 31, 1713, confirmed to her Gibraltar, Minorca, Hudson's Bay, Nova Scotia, Newfoundland, and the French part of St. Christopher. The Stuart Pretender was to be expelled from France, and the Parliament's right to fix the succession to the throne was recognised. In addition, the Assiento treaty with Spain, made at the same time, gave England a monopoly of the profitable slave-trade with the Spanish colonies, against which there was as yet no stirring of the nation's conscience.

Harley, now Earl of Oxford, had a restless colleague in St. John, Viscount Bolingbroke, who openly advocated a Stuart restoration. Reaction was running very strong. The Schism Act of 1714 forbade dissenters to teach in public or even in private schools, and the non-conformists feared even worse persecutions. Mrs., now Lady, Masham quarrelled with her relative Oxford; Anne dismissed him on July 27, 1714, and Bolingbroke saw power within his grasp. But the unhappy queen, worn out by the factions about her and longing for death as a weary traveller welcomes sleep, was stricken with mortal illness before Bolingbroke had time to make his plans, which would certainly have involved the

Intrigues for
a Stuart
succession.

return of the son of James II. When the queen was known to be dying, three Whig dukes, Argyle, Shrewsbury, and Somerset, appeared in the queen's council and claimed a voice in the nation's affairs. It was vital to them that the line of Hanover should succeed, and when Anne died they had the law on their side. The officials carried out



HENRY ST. JOHN, VISCOUNT
BOLINGBROKE (1678-1751).

the provisions already made by Parliament; George I was proclaimed king, and the old horror of civil war made many whose preferences were for the Stuarts acquiesce in an accomplished fact. Bolingbroke, all hope of his own triumph ended, wrote to Swift: "The Earl of Oxford was removed on Tuesday; the queen died on Sunday. What a world this is, and how does fortune banter us!" "It is true, my lord," Swift replied, "the events of five days last

week might furnish morals for another volume of Seneca." The quiet succession of George I was indeed almost a miracle.

To rule a haughty and insular people had come a German prince with few personal attractions and ignorant even of the English tongue. His only hope of retaining his new kingdom was in the Whigs. Though they brought on promptly an election, which gave them a great majority, they knew that public opinion was really against them, and to postpone as long as possible a second appeal to the people, they passed, in 1716, the Septennial Bill, changing the duration of Parliament from three to seven years. It was a high-handed proceeding for a Parliament chosen

The Hanoverian
succession,
1714.

for three years thus to prolong its own life to seven, and its only justification is in the fact that before the seven years had passed the country was reconciled to the Whigs. They were the friends of trade, and had the commercial class behind them. They were the friends, too, of tolerance, which the spirit of the age now favoured. Bolingbroke had told the Tories that they must look to the Stuart Pretender, but the Tory squires, afraid of civil war, would not act on the advice, and adjusted themselves to the new line as best they could. Of the divine right of kings we hear henceforth little from them.

The Stuart Pretender, James Edward, landed in Scotland in 1715, and made a fight for the throne. Those who came in contact with him found him stupid, headstrong, too dull to take good advice, and fanatically devoted to the Roman Catholic faith. Yet ten thousand men rallied round the Stuart banner at Braemar. Incompetence on the one side, energy on the other, soon wrecked the enterprise. The Jacobite leader Mar was pitted against Argyle, grandson of the Argyle who had tried to make Monmouth king, and an ardent Whig. Edinburgh was for a time in danger, and a rising took place in the north of England under Mr. Forster and Lord Derwentwater. But Louis XIV died just at the critical moment, and France gave no help. At Preston the English revolt was crushed, and in Scotland Mar's force, after an indecisive engagement at Sheriffmuir, melted away. Mar and the Pretender escaped with great difficulty, but some forty of their followers perished on the scaffold, and though the government acted on the whole with moderation, many others lost estates and titles. It had already impeached the former Tory leaders, Oxford, Bolingbroke, and Ormonde. The two last escaped to the Continent, and Atterbury, Bishop of Rochester, another Jacobite leader, was banished. Oxford spent two years in the Tower—the last English minister to be

The Stuart Pretender and the rising of 1715.

punished on the worn-out theory that a fallen statesman must be a criminal.

So little afraid of their opponents were the Whigs that they quarrelled among themselves. The leaders Stanhope and Sunderland drove Sir Robert Walpole and their other chief colleagues from office in 1717; and joined France, the former enemy, in an attack on Spain to force her to permit the English to trade with her American possessions in accordance with the terms of the Assiento Treaty. The English belief in the riches of this trade soon made possible the South Sea Bubble, one of the most amazing crazes in history. England was growing rich, good investments were scarce, and there was no financial organ to criticise such as were offered. By the treaty of 1713 the British gained control of the trade in negroes with Spanish America, and they might besides send one ship to Panama each year. An invincible belief seized the public that in this narrowly restricted trade there were vast opportunities for wealth. At the close of Anne's reign, Harley's government used this belief for its own ends, and gave the South Sea Company a monopoly of the trade on condition of its lending the government £10,000,000 at 6 per cent to pay off floating debts that were a constant embarrassment. The company not only did this, but promised when its profits increased to reduce the interest of the debt to 4 per cent, and ultimately to help the government to extinguish it by a sinking fund. In 1719 the company proposed to take up no less than £30,000,000 of government securities, and the public proved ready to buy all the South Sea stock that was offered; £4,000,000 of shares issued in July, 1720, brought £40,000,000 in the market. A fever of speculation seized the nation; landowners, clergymen, widows sold everything to buy South Sea stock. The government would, it was said, exchange Gibraltar and Port Mahon for rich gold-mines in Peru to be controlled by the com-

The South Sea
Bubble, 1720.

pany, and persons in the government with influence at court, received shares improperly. The directors promised impossible dividends, and, of course, in the end a crash came.

Walpole had opposed the South Sea scheme, though he made money out of speculation in the stock, and in the moment of disaster the king dismissed Stanhope and Sunderland, who soon died, and called upon Walpole to take charge of the finances. It was the beginning of his long supremacy. He reorganized the South Sea Company, leaving it with a capital of £33,000,000 and still a gigantic corporation. The shareholders got one share in the new company for three in the old, government guaranteed dividends on half the stock, and with something short of utter ruin the crisis passed. It wrought much harm; that it brought Walpole to the front and made his real capacity apparent must be counted among its good results, for, as no one else, Walpole saw what England needed, and had the courage and ability to hold the government to its real tasks.



SIR ROBERT WALPOLE,
EARL OF ORFORD (1676-1745).

In earlier ages the king had been the real head of the government. Sir Robert Walpole is the first name in the long roll of British prime ministers—men who rule the state though they use the sovereign's name. He was a jovial English squire, loose in morals, but honest, sensible, and conscientious in discharging his public duties. He served a king who was always a foreigner. George I would not learn English, and could talk with Walpole only in what Latin remained to him from his school days; he could

Walpole's
supremacy.

not preside at his own council, and a prime minister was necessary to act for the king. He took the king's place as the director of the ministry, and ruled with a completeness of authority that was modelled, assailants said, upon Richelieu's power in France. George I's sudden death in 1727 hardly disturbed Walpole's supremacy. Though the new king, George II, was at first resolved to turn him out, Walpole was in reality indispensable and his sway lasted for nearly twenty years. He had to manage both king and Parliament. No minister could remain in power without a majority in the House of Commons; to keep such a majority a well-organized party was necessary, and Walpole finally matured the party system. Every favour in the gift of government, every post, civil, military, or ecclesiastical, that he could control went to his own political friends. He tried to appoint even party colonels in the army, but George II, who took pride in his soldiers, interfered: "I will order my army as I see fit; for your scoundrels of the House of Commons you may do as you please."

Walpole found it no easy task to manage the king. George II took himself very seriously. On the whole he was a man of honour, loyal to his friends, cautious, sober, and methodical. But he was narrow-minded, and had the loose morals of the privileged classes of his time. Frederick William, King of Prussia, called George a comedian, and this quality appears in his everlasting posing and bluster. "Snappings and snubbings" were the staple of his talk with Caroline, his remarkable queen; he would call her a fool to her face, and denounce her friends as scoundrels, puppies, or imbeciles; yet he spent seven or eight hours daily in her society, wrote her interminable letters when he was away, and was heart-broken when she died in 1737. She never appeared to differ from him. George would sneer at his predecessors who had been ruled by wives or

George II and
his queen.

favourites, and ask with absurd complacency who it was that governed him. Most men understood very well that it was Caroline of Anspach; when Walpole persuaded her, he had really persuaded the king. She was a shrewd, able, and really modest woman, though Walpole jested brutally with her about George's conduct, and decent society would not to-day tolerate the language of either of them.



CAROLINE OF ANSPACH, QUEEN OF
GEORGE II (1682-1737).

During eighty years of civil war, revolution, and faction, England had rarely seen stable government, and it was now a statesman's task to evolve a workable system. Walpole did it. "He durst do right," his son said of him, "but he durst do wrong, too"; he was not of the heroic type ready to perish for an ideal. The chief features of his policy were to let alone troublesome issues, such as those concerned with religion; to attempt no great changes; to keep out of war; and to promote the landed and commercial interests. He was a skilful pamphleteer and his industry was amazing; he wrote most of his letters and even copied long papers with his own hand. In art he showed his interest by making a valuable collection of pictures, but for music and literature he cared nothing. With coarse quips and jests he faced the rough issues of party warfare, and he did not take reverses tragically. It was the Whig Walpole who saved England from a permanent Whig oligarchy. His friends wished so to limit the crown's power that no single sovereign could create more than six peers. An obstinate majority could not then have been overcome by

Walpole's
character and
policy of peace.

new creations, and Walpole successfully opposed the plan. He tried to make but one great reform—to ease the heavy burdens on the land by an excise tax on tobacco and wine. We are now familiar with these excise duties, which began in England during the civil war and were long disliked. The organized opposition in Parliament told the people that Walpole aimed to levy an excise not only upon tobacco, but upon clothing, food, and all other necessities, and that an army of excise men would invade every household to act as spies and agents for the government. Walpole found public opinion against the bill and in 1733, amidst the taunts of his enemies, withdrew it; but later governments have made one by one the changes he proposed. By abolishing the duties upon about one hundred and fifty articles of import and export he paved the way for free trade.

To retain a majority in Parliament, Walpole, it is said, practised shameless bribery. Yet after his fall a hostile committee of Parliament made a rigid scrutiny of his conduct, and only two fully proved instances are known; the practice was not as open as the party vehemence of the time declared. Walpole once pointed to a group of men opposing him and said contemptuously, "All these have their price," and the report went about that he had said every one could be bribed. No one knew better than he that, even with the low moral tone of the age, this was not true. He loved power, and was not scrupulous in his use of weapons, but he had the real interests of the country at heart, and spent its money with prudence. The masses of his time were warlike and fanatical, and did not like his policy of peace. He was never popular: at almost any time in his career an election under the modern system would have overthrown him. He held office by means of the pocket boroughs of the Whig magnates, and fell when they deserted him.

The measure
of Walpole's
corruption.

The drift of the times was indeed against peace. In Spanish America the British grossly abused their trading privileges: the cargo of the one ship which they had the right to send each year was fraudulently replenished from other vessels, and in addition a huge contraband trade grew up. The Spanish stopped and searched English ships, and opponents of Walpole repeated harrowing tales of English sailors martyred in Spanish dungeons. A certain Captain Jenkins told Parliament that his ship had been illegally stopped by Spanish coast-guards, who tore off his ear with the taunt that he might take it to his king, carried away his nautical instruments, and left him to get home as best he could. He was asked what he had thought when helpless in Spanish hands, and replied in a well-studied phrase, "I committed my soul to God and my cause to my country." At a later time Burke believed that the tale was a fable, but the story of Jenkins's ear seized the imagination of a warlike people, and helped to force Walpole into war with Spain. Even when he saw that the struggle must come, he still clung ingloriously to office. Church bells rang in 1739 because war had begun; but the head of the government said bitterly, "they are ringing their bells: they will soon be wringing their hands," and reverses came speedily. Admiral Vernon failed disastrously before Cartagena, in the Isthmus of Panama. Commodore Anson, after a fearful passage, got round Cape Horn into the Pacific, and was not heard of for nearly four years: Britain thought that he was lost, though in fact he was reaping a rich harvest from Spanish galleons. Walpole was blamed for the unsuccessful war; the election of 1741 turned against him, and in February, 1742, he was forced to resign. He had used bribery to retain power, and bribery helped to drive him out. George II parted from his minister with genuine regret. Walpole became Earl of Orford, but never again took office.

The contest begun in 1739, in the form of a war with Spain, proved to be Britain's challenge to the world for supremacy in America and India, and, with slight interruption, it continued until the fall of Napoleon in 1815, and the establishment of the British Empire as we know it.

The events of the war. The second Jacobite rising, 1745.

There was no strong man to succeed Walpole. Carteret, soon to be Earl Granville, divided power with the Duke of Newcastle, but was driven out in 1744. Then Newcastle's brother, Henry Pelham, took the chief place, and, with varying fortunes, remained at the helm until his death, ten years later. The era was momentous in Europe. In 1740 Maria Theresa succeeded to the motley Austrian dominions, and her right as a woman to rule was soon disputed. Frederick II of Prussia seized the Austrian province of Silesia, and nearly all Europe was involved in the War of the Austrian Succession. France and Spain united to attack Maria Theresa; George II, as a German prince, aided her, and in person, on June 16, 1743, at the head of Hanoverian, Austrian, Dutch, and other forces, defeated the French at Dettingen on the Main. Marshal Saxe in turn defeated the British and their allies at Fontenoy in May, 1745; but in America the New England colonists won a balancing success, by taking the French fortress of Louisbourg, in Cape Breton. In the same year, Prince Charles Edward, the "Young Pretender," grandson of James II, landed in the Highlands of Scotland. He had only seven followers, but was warmly welcomed and able to occupy Edinburgh. At Preston Pans he defeated George II's general, Cope, and Scotland seemed at his feet. Even London fell into a panic, and when Charles marched into England George II prepared to fly to the Continent. But George's son, the Duke of Cumberland, met the Pretender on Culloden Moor on April 16, 1746. This time the Highland charge failed, and Cumberland won the name of "Butcher" by the awful slaughter that fol-

lowed; even the wounded were massacred. There were executions for treason, and England in the end came successfully out of both this civil and the foreign war. The Stuart cause was finally wrecked, and by the Treaty of Aix-la-Chapelle in 1748 all conquests, except Silesia, were restored on each side.¹

The treaty, however, settled little. In America the thirteen English colonies, and Virginia, especially, were alarmed at France's plan to seize the whole country bordering on the Ohio and the Mississippi, and to exclude the English



WILLIAM AUGUSTUS, DUKE OF CUMBERLAND (1721-1765).

from the west. In 1754 the French built Fort Duquesne on the Ohio, where Pittsburg now stands, and Virginia sent George Washington, a young officer of militia, to drive them back. Instead, he was himself repulsed, and in the next year a considerable army, under General Braddock, sent out from England to check France's designs, was ambushed and nearly destroyed in a similar attempt. And formal war had not been declared! It came in 1756. France and Russia joined Austria in attacking Frederick the Great, who still kept Silesia, and England helped Frederick. This Seven Years' War was to prove one of the most momentous in history, and it opened disastrously for

The Seven
Years' War.

¹ In 1752 Britain adopted the Gregorian or New Style of reckoning the days of the month. By this the day after Wednesday, September 2, 1752, was called Thursday, September 14, 1752, eleven days being omitted. Events before 1752 are sometimes reckoned in this New Style—a fact that accounts for some of the variant dates that appear confusing.

Britain and Prussia. The Whigs had been too long in power, and there were among them bitter rivalries, gross abuse of patronage, and corruption far surpassing Walpole's. Incompetent men held high office, and both the army and the navy were in no condition for active service. In 1756 the French captured Minorca and the British power in India was defied, also in 1756, by Surajah Dowlah, the native ruler of Bengal, who kept for a night 146 English in a prison room 18 feet long and 14 broad, so that from this "Black Hole of Calcutta" only 23 came out alive. Frederick the Great met terrible reverses in Germany. At last British public opinion revolted against those who had a part in the disasters; Admiral Byng, by whose fault Minorca was lost, was tried by court-martial and shot, and the clique which monopolized office found the nation against them. To produce better things only a leader was needed, and he was at hand.

The career of
William Pitt.

William Pitt now became supreme for a brief but glorious period. Though George II disliked Pitt, who had been a fearless critic of Hanoverian influence in England, there was a blunt honesty in the old king. "Sire, give me your confidence



WILLIAM PITT, EARL OF
CHATHAM (1708-1778).

and I will deserve it," Pitt said, in the cringing tone he could not help assuming to royalty. "Deserve my confidence and you shall have it," George replied, and kept his word. Pitt formed in 1757 a coalition with Newcastle, who was to be Prime Minister and to attend to the hungry office-seekers, while Pitt was to carry on the war. He had a sublime arrogance. "I know that I can save this nation, and that nobody else can," he said to the Duke of Devonshire. His strength was in his frank

appeal to the nation's higher motives. The effect of his studied and dramatic oratory was amazing. In him spoke the best elements of English public life; unworthy men quailed before his fierce invective, and he now carried all before him.

Pitt was resolved to give Britain world-wide supremacy and to humble France beyond the possibility of future rivalry. He chose his agents for their efficiency, not for their family influence. General Amherst took Louisbourg in 1758. Wolfe, a young and, to the undiscerning eye, an untried officer, by defeating the French before Quebec in 1759, made the conquest of Canada secure. England paid a huge subsidy to Frederick, and him, too, fortune soon began to favour. The English harassed the coasts of France, and won naval victories in 1759 at Lagos and off Quiberon Bay. In India Clive avenged the Black Hole of Calcutta, and by the great battle of Plassey in June, 1757, secured Bengal to England. The nation's enthusiasm ran high. Never before had it embarked on such a career of conquest, but in the midst of it all George II died, and his death was a disaster for England. George III, who succeeded, though only twenty-two years old, was resolved from the first himself to rule, and to yield power to no potent minister. He drew up his first speech to Parliament without consulting his cabinet; the speech itself implied censure of their policy of war, and Pitt soon found his hands tied. He knew that Spain was getting ready to attack England in aid of France, and advised that she should herself be



JAMES WOLFE (1726-1759).

attacked, but his advice was overruled. The king, it was known, desired to be rid of him, and in October, 1761, he resigned. All the other cabinet ministers remained in office except Pitt's brother-in-law, Lord Temple, but with Pitt went the life and vigour of the ministry.

Though the cabinet had refused to believe that Spain meant to fight, she suddenly threw off the mask, made

The Peace of
Paris, 1763.

haughty demands, and within three months after Pitt's fall declared war. But the British conquered even without Pitt. They captured

Havana, in Cuba, seized the Philippines, and took great Spanish treasure on the high seas. Yet, in spite of success, George III was resolved to have peace at almost any price, and on February 10, 1763, the Peace of Paris was

finally signed. England made enormous gains, but not all that a sterner policy might have secured. France abandoned her dream of empire in North America, and Canada became British territory. Britain recovered Minorca, the loss of which had caused Admiral Byng's execution. In the West Indies she secured much, but she gave up Guadeloupe and some other islands. In India, though conquests on both sides



FREDERICK THE GREAT (1712-1786).

were restored, Britain was at last supreme. Spain recovered Cuba and the Philippines, but she surrendered Florida to Great Britain, taking Louisiana from France as compensation. Britain's concessions in the West Indies aroused special fury. The West Indian trade was

then of the first importance. Guadeloupe had developed greatly during the years of British occupation, and it was claimed with some reason that the ministry had needlessly surrendered the island to France. One phase of the peace policy was the stopping of subsidies to Frederick the Great. No doubt, after fair notice a paymaster may change his plans, but Frederick complained bitterly that he had been betrayed, and henceforth he hated England. But he, too, through the succession of his admirer, Peter III, to Elizabeth in Russia, was able to make the favourable Peace of Hubertsburg, by which he retained Silesia.

The close of the Seven Years' War marks a distinct stage in Britain's history. She had won a great colonial empire; she was left without serious rivalry in India; and new sources of vast wealth were now open to her. An era of unparalleled prosperity seemed to have come. Yet her empire was on the verge of disruption, and before her lay half a century of almost continuous war.

SUMMARY OF DATES

William and Mary became King and Queen in February, 1689, and **The Toleration Act** and **The Bill of Rights** were passed in **1689**. **The Battle of the Boyne**, where James II was finally defeated, was in **1690**, and France suffered naval defeat at **La Hogue** in **1692**. The National Debt began in 1693, and the Bank of England was established in 1694. **The Triennial Act** was passed in **1694**, and Queen Mary died in that year. **The Peace of Ryswick** with France was made in **1697**. Anne's succession in 1702 was followed immediately by war with France under Marlborough's lead. **The English took Gibraltar** in **1704**, and still hold it. **Blenheim** in **1704**, **Ramillies** in **1706**, **Oudenarde** in **1708**, **Malplaquet** in **1709**, were all military triumphs for the English, and chiefly for Marlborough. During the war, **England and Scotland were united to form Great Britain** in **1707**. Through the Tory reaction Marlborough was dismissed from office in 1711. **The Treaty of Utrecht** was made in **1713**, and in 1714 Anne died. With George I's reign began a long period of Whig rule. **The Stuart rising of 1715** ended with the flight of the Pre-

tender in 1716. **The Septennial Act**, prolonging the duration of Parliaments from three to seven years, **was passed in 1716**. **The South Sea Bubble of 1720** brought Walpole into power in 1721, and an uneventful, but really fruitful, period followed. George I died in 1727. War with Spain broke out in 1739, and soon extended to France. **Walpole fell in 1742**. George II won Dettingen in 1743, but Fontenoy in 1745 was a French victory. The New England colonists captured Louisbourg, in Cape Breton, in 1745. In the same year the Pretender, Charles Edward, landed in Scotland, but was defeated at **Culloden in 1746**. **The Peace of Aix-la-Chapelle was in 1748**. Braddock was defeated and killed near Fort Duquesne in 1756, the year also of the tragedy of the Black Hole of Calcutta. War was formally declared in 1756, and for failing to relieve Minorca, Admiral Byng was shot in 1757. Pitt became the ruling spirit in the Duke of Newcastle's administration in 1757. Clive won in India **the Battle of Plassey in 1757**. Louisbourg, in Cape Breton, was again taken in 1758, and **Quebec in 1759**. George II died in 1760, Pitt resigned in 1761, and with Lord Bute as Prime Minister, **The Peace of Paris was made in 1763**.

BOOKS FOR REFERENCE

* Macaulay and Ranke as before; McCarthy, the Four Georges and William IV (4 vols., 1901); * Lecky, History of England in the 18th Century (8 vols., 1892); Burnet, History of His Own Time (new edition, 1883); Horace Walpole's Selected Letters, edited by Yonge (2 vols., 1889); * Morley, Walpole (Twelve English Statesmen) (1889).

CHAPTER XVIII

The Era of the American Revolution

(1763-1789—26 years)

George III; born 1738; succeeded 1760; died 1820.

[The period, the main interest of which in British history is the Revolution in America, saw great changes in Europe. Events in France drifted rapidly towards revolution. The Jesuits were expelled in 1764, and the order was dissolved by the Pope in 1773. In 1774 Turgot became a minister under the young king, Louis XVI, and projected great reforms, but he was dismissed from office in 1776. France was soon drawn into the American war. Necker, who managed her finances prudently from 1776 to 1781, was dismissed in the latter year, and a succession of corrupt or incompetent ministers led her into the financial distress that was the primary cause of the outbreak of the Revolution in 1789. In northeastern Europe the anarchic condition of Poland made inevitable its partition, and Prussia, Russia, and Austria divided the spoil. Frederick the Great of Prussia (d. 1786), Catherine II of Russia (d. 1796), and Joseph II of Austria (d. 1790), all sovereigns of remarkable character, flourished during the period, and Russia began to play a leading part in European diplomacy.]

GEORGE III made the right of the sovereign to rule England in person the supreme question of his time.

Aims of
George III. His mother, the widow of Frederick, Prince of Wales, was a German princess, with the absolutist ideas of the despotic little courts of Germany, and her reiterated direction, "George, be a king," became famous. "Born and educated in this country, I glory in the name of Briton," George said, in his opening speech to Parliament. The Hanoverians were

no longer foreigners; the Stuart cause* was dead, and George was so wholly English that he never travelled farther than York.

The old Duke of Newcastle, Prime Minister when George II died, belonged to a group of Whig leaders whom George III disliked, and was treated with such indignity that his resignation soon followed Pitt's. George's favourite, Lord Bute, took his place. There was scandal about Bute's relations with the king's mother; he was besides a Scot, and English hatred against that nation was still often savage. Bute, in terror at his own unpopularity, also soon retired from office. Lord George Grenville took his place in 1763. But political conditions were uncertain and ministries changed rapidly. In 1765 Lord Rockingham succeeded Grenville, held office for a year, and gave way in 1766 to the Duke of Grafton as nominal Prime Minister with Pitt, who now became Earl of Chatham, as the real director of the government. Failing health paralyzed Chatham's activities, the ministry staggered along for nearly four years, and then in 1770 the king made Lord North the chief of a new cabinet. He had found at last the servant whom he desired. The Whigs, broken into groups—"Bedford's Party," "Rockingham's Party," "Chatham's Party," "The Grenville's," each warring upon the others—were no longer a compact force. North himself was a man of high personal character. Though he was indolent, and in person ungainly, he had tact, wit, and a real knowledge of affairs. But his sweet temper, which his opponents could never ruffle, made him yield to the despotic will of George III, and his lease of power for twelve years proved disastrous.

Ever since George I's time the Whig party had ruled, but George III announced himself as the patriot king who would consider the welfare not of a party, but of the state as a whole. He looked upon his dominions and sub-

The changes of
ministry until
Lord North
became Prime
Minister.

jects as his personal property. Each minister was to be responsible to him alone, and he, raised by his position high above the realm of party, would study the welfare of all his people. Charles I tried to master Parliament by the sword; Henry VIII accomplished the easier task of insuring the existence of a Parliament that would do his will; and George followed the Tudor rather than the Stuart, and bought a majority in Parliament. He called those who supported him the "King's Friends," and Earl Temple was once ordered by the king to say in Parliament that any one voting for a certain bill would be considered the king's enemy. With gross insults, George drove some of the greatest nobles of the kingdom from lord lieutenancies and other offices because they opposed his measures, and he expelled from the public service the humblest clerks of their party. Never was the spoils system more odiously enforced. Circumstances favoured the king's policy. Expansion in trade and the increase of wealth through conquests, especially in India, encouraged extravagant living and the gambling spirit that lent itself to corruption. In the House of Commons, owing to the peculiar conditions by which membership in that House was determined, the king easily secured a majority. For a century and a half the constituencies had remained unaltered, and while deserted boroughs sent not only one but two members to Parliament, new and important places were without representation. Middlesex and London together had one-fifth the number of members given to

The character of
George's rule.



GEORGE III.

Cornwall; of the 513 members who sat for England and Wales one-half represented 11,500 voters; there were six constituencies each with not more than three electors. It was easy to buy support when members had little to fear from public opinion, and George purchased it by money and by office. In 1770 two-fifths of the members of the House of Commons held posts under the government. The votes of excise men and other public officials throughout the country controlled, it is said, seventy seats. Bribes were paid almost publicly; the Secretary of the Treasury acknowledged that in a single morning £25,000 was paid for votes. In buying the press £30,000 was spent during the first two years of George's reign. The Whig leaders fought the king's friends with the same weapons of corruption, and a single election in the town of Northampton cost each party £30,000. George was his own high-priest of corruption, doing the work in person. Though in politics he was vindictive, and stooped to the treachery of setting rival leaders against each other by a malicious use of statements made in the confidence of the royal closet, in his private relations he was strict in morals, simple in tastes, and pre-eminently an English gentleman of the better type.

Against George's policy protests, of course, were made. John Wilkes, the spendthrift son of a London distiller, founded in 1762 a newspaper called *The North Briton*, which soon became very popular. He attacked the court party with great vehemence, and adopted the novelty in English journalism of printing in full the names of those he assailed. In No. 45 he criticised the speech made by the king at the closing of Parliament on April 19, 1763. It was, he said, a most abandoned instance of ministerial effrontery and advocated odious measures. Wilkes fancied himself secure in his privilege as a member of Parliament, but the government pressed a charge of libel for speaking disre-

The case of
John Wilkes.

spectfully of the king and issued a general warrant, which, without mentioning any names, ordered the seizure of those concerned with the publication. No less than forty-nine persons were arrested. Wilkes was thrown into the Tower, and then began a struggle which lasted for years. The judges decided that Wilkes's privilege as a member of Parliament had been violated, and he brought actions against those concerned in his arrest. The king took up the case hotly, and the bribed House of Commons expelled Wilkes in 1764. But by this time he was a popular hero, and "Wilkes and Liberty" had become a rallying cry. The court party did not stop short of planning what was practically murder. An expert duellist, Martin, a corrupt official of the government, challenged Wilkes and nearly killed him in a duel. He soon retired to France. When he was found guilty of the charges against him and did not appear for sentence, he was declared an outlaw.

The court seemed to have triumphed, but in February, 1768, Wilkes returned to England, avoided arrest for a time, and offered himself first for London and then for Middlesex as a candidate for the House of Commons. The king was still resolved to punish him, and the contest has become memorable in literature because of the able but envenomed writing of "Junius" in support of Wilkes. In shop-windows, before ale-houses, even on trinkets appeared his portrait. He was sent to prison for a time but the mob went wild in his cause. People in the streets were forced to shout for Wilkes; the stately Austrian ambassador was dragged from his coach that the mob might chalk on the soles of his boots "45," the libellous number of *The North Briton*; and Benjamin Franklin observed that number on nearly all the houses he saw within fifteen miles of London. Wilkes was elected, but the House of Commons again promptly expelled him. The voters of Middlesex unanimously re-elected him, and then the House of Commons, going

The birth of
Radicalism.

beyond its powers, declared him incapable of sitting. He was elected a third time, but the House declared the rival candidate, Colonel Luttrell, who received 296 votes to 1,143 for Wilkes, to be the elected member. The king closed the session amidst popular fury, and Wilkes had lost his seat. But London delighted to do him honour, and made him successively Alderman, Sheriff, and Lord Mayor. In the end Wilkes won. Again in 1774 he was unanimously elected, and this time was allowed to sit for Middlesex; in 1782 a new House of Commons even took the humiliating step, on Wilkes's own motion, of rescinding the resolution of 1769 by which he had been declared incapable of sitting. Permanent results flowed from the Wilkes agitation. The gathering of huge crowds in the open air was already familiar in connection with Whitefield's and Wesley's preaching, and great political meetings, hitherto unknown, were held in Wilkes's interest. From London the practice spread all over England. Never before had the masses been appealed to in this way; the doings in Parliament came under full discussion, popular clubs were formed to oppose the influence of "The King's Friends," and it was in this agitation that Radicalism was born, with its sweeping programme of reform, including manhood suffrage and Parliaments chosen for one year only.

The violent passions of the mob were soon again aroused, this time on a religious issue. It was still the law that a priest saying mass in England should suffer perpetual imprisonment, that a Roman Catholic heir, if educated abroad, should forfeit his estates to the nearest Protestant heir, and that no Roman Catholic could purchase land. In 1778 Sir George Savile persuaded Parliament to repeal these laws, but the half-mad Lord George Gordon led in a fanatical protest against any relief. The London mob, taking up the matter riotously in June, 1780, destroyed many Roman Catholic chapels; burned Newgate and three

The Gordon
Riots.

other prisons and let loose their inmates; and destroyed some private houses, among them that of Lord Mansfield with his splendid library. All London was in danger; an observer counted thirty-six fires raging at one time. During the disturbances nearly three hundred were killed, and the Gordon Riots long remained a terrible reminder to Londoners of the brutal savagery lying dormant in that city. It was not against the sturdy, courageous, obstinate, and devout Briton who was their king, but against his ministers, that the mob was enraged. Even when most in the wrong, George III usually had public opinion behind him.

The most momentous event of George's reign is the American War. The thirteen American colonies now contained nearly half as many people as England itself, and they had a great trade. While they were in fact states, subject indeed to the king as sovereign, but nearly as independent of the British Parliament as Scotland was before the Union, in England they were looked upon in much the same light as a remote and obscure county, with, like many an English county, no influence in the government. The Seven Years' War left Britain with a huge debt of £140,000,000, incurred largely on behalf of America. No doubt the British taxpayer derived indirect benefits that brought full compensation for this burden; he had an enlarged market, and a vast stream of wealth flowed into Great Britain from her wider possessions. But landowners saw one thing with perfect clearness—that to meet the cost of the war they were expected to bear the enormous load of a tax of four shillings per acre, and their temper became dangerous. The colonies, on their side, suffered much by the war. They had raised 20,000 troops and incurred large debts, and the territory won from France at the cost of war was not placed in any way under their control. Trouble with America began as soon as the Seven Years' War ended.

The question of
America.

Lord George Grenville, who in 1763 succeeded Bute as Prime Minister, was a painstaking statesman, and, it was said, lost America because he studied the despatches which some of his predecessors had hardly opened. He made up his mind that the colonies must now be taxed, not for the benefit of the mother country, but to pay the cost of their own defence. An army of 10,000 men would be necessary for this purpose. It was indeed fitting that the colonies should protect themselves; Philadelphia and Boston were flourishing cities, surpassed by only a few in the mother country, and in enlightenment the colonial voters were far in advance of those at home. The real difficulty was not about the duty of defence, but about Britain's right to levy taxes in America for this purpose. Though

The resolve to
tax the colonies.

Pro Patria
The first Man that either
distributes or makes use of Stamp
Paper let him take Care of
his House, Person, & Effects.

*Vox Populi;
We Dare*

AN INTIMIDATING POSTER AGAINST OBEYING THE STAMP ACT.

the British Parliament had never ventured directly to tax even Ireland, a conquered country, in 1764 Grenville gave notice of a bill to tax the colonies. He proposed a stamp tax, because of its cheapness and ease of collection. The British Government was to issue stamps and stamped paper, and henceforth promis-

The Stamp Act.

sory notes, bills, bonds, leases, insurance policies, etc., in the colonies were to be valid only when stamped. In the colonies, as already in the mother country, newspapers must pay the stamp duty. The stamps were to be sold at Government offices in the chief colonial centres.

Grenville's bill excited but languid interest in England, and passed unopposed in an almost empty House.

Keen opposition
to the act.

The government issued supplies of stamped paper, and appointed officers to collect the revenue. In the West Indies and Canada

the bill was quietly received, but tumult greeted it in the American provinces. Representatives of nine colonies met at New York in October, 1765, and drew up a protest asserting that Parliament could not tax those who sent to it no members. Boston became the centre of agitation. Oliver, the secretary of the province, had accepted the post of stamp distributor, but the mob destroyed the stamp office and sacked his house and that of Hutchinson, the Chief Justice. Lawyers agreed not to use stamped paper. Merchants promised to order no goods, and even to pay no debts, in England until the act was repealed. Boxes of stamps arriving from England were destroyed. There followed a paralysis of legal business, and finally the colonial governments issued proclamations authorizing non-compliance with the law. Pitt assailed the act, but at the same time claimed that Parliament was supreme over the colonies, and could legislate for, though it ought not to tax, them. His views prevailed. The check to trade with America had caused great distress in England. Grenville soon retired from office, and under Rockingham's ministry the act was repealed, on March 18, 1766; but Parliament



ANDREW OLIVER
(1706-1774).

passed also a Declaratory Act asserting the supremacy of the British Parliament.

The repeal of the Stamp Act caused rejoicing in America. Philadelphia Quakers, who during the agitation had worn only homespun, resolved to wear new suits of English manufacture on the king's birthday. Benjamin Franklin and his family had obeyed the rule to wear only cloth of home manufacture, but he now wrote to his wife from London that he was sending her material for a new gown. Statues were raised to the king and Pitt, and the difficulty seemed ended. Yet feeling had been definitely arrayed in the colonies against the mother country and had taken a violent form, while there was resentment in England at this violence and at the refusal to share the burden of taxation. No time was given for better conditions to mature. In January, 1767, only a few months after the repeal of the Stamp Act, Charles Townshend, a young and brilliant member of the Duke of Grafton's government, rose in Parliament, and, to the amazement of his colleagues, promised to raise from the American colonies the revenue to support their necessary military establishment. New York had recently declined to furnish provisions for British troops quartered there, and Parliament was in an angry mood. Following Townshend's lead it now levied a duty, to be paid at American ports, on glass, red and white lead, paper, and tea. It showed, too, an aggressive spirit against American pretensions by suspending the powers of the New York Legislature, and deciding to enforce the severe laws restricting the trade of the colonies.

After this legislation the trouble was incurable. While England thought the colonies were weak, and that she could easily coerce them, they, for their part, were sure that the mother country would yield rather than imperil her American trade. Samuel Adams, the chief leader in

Massachusetts, was a resolute and skilful agitator, and Boston became so menacing that to insure order the British Government sent there troops and war-ships in 1768. To the officers and men the people showed every indignity that sullen and sometimes violent dislike dared hazard, and finally the British Government dissolved the Legislatures of Massachusetts and of half a dozen other colonies. But after new elections, the Legislatures were as defiant as ever. The inevitable bloodshed came in 1770. Some English soldiers, harassed in the streets by a Boston mob and close pressed, at last fired upon the crowd, killing three or four. This "Boston Massacre" might have been followed by an immediate appeal to arms, had not a change come in the councils of the mother country. On the very day of the bloodshed, Lord North introduced into the British Parliament an act repealing all the American duties except the tax on tea; and this was retained, not to raise a revenue, but to assert the abstract right of the mother country to tax the colonies. For a time the bill brought quiet to America.

To prevent the smuggling which robbed the British trader of his monopoly of the American market, British war-ships still patrolled the American shores. One of these ships, the *Gaspee*, commanded by Lieutenant Duddingston, had exasperated the Rhode Islanders by interfering with trade long carried on with impunity. In June, 1772, the *Gaspee* ran aground near Providence while chasing a suspected vessel, and the aggrieved traders had at length their opportunity. They attacked her at night, wounded Duddingston severely, removed the crew, and then set the ship on fire. The perpetrators of the outrage returned to Providence in broad daylight, and no reward could induce information against them. There was another unfortunate incident. The postal service in the colonies was

All taxes but those on tea finally repealed.

Further causes of conflict.

carried on by the home government, and Benjamin Franklin, perhaps the ablest man that the colonies had produced,



BENJAMIN FRANKLIN (1706-1790).

Some letters from Oliver and Hutchinson, two high officials of Massachusetts, to a friend in England, condemning severely the colonial cause, were made public by Franklin's instrumentality. In America it was Oliver and Hutchinson who were condemned for attacking the popular party, but in England Franklin was accused of dishonourable conduct for allowing private letters to reach

the public. In 1774 the grave and dignified old man was called before a committee of the Privy Council, and stood erect and motionless under a scathing attack from Wedderburn, the Attorney-General. He was ignominiously dismissed from his office, and the most influential man in America had henceforth the sense of personal injury. This did not keep him from working for a time for conciliation, but, in the end, he became the resolute foe of British connection.

The final crisis soon came. The East Indian Company had a large surplus stock of tea, and resolved to export it to America.

The "Boston Tea Party," 1773.

The duty on tea was the sole remnant of Townshend's plan to tax the colonies; but


the company was prepared to pay the duty, and appointed agents at various American ports to receive the cargoes



THOMAS HUTCHINSON (1711-1780).

of the tea ships. New England agitators had already de-
 claimed against even the use of tea while the tax remained,
 and now they saw that tea was to be imported in immense
 quantities by a powerful corporation. The excitement in
 America rose to fever heat. At Philadelphia, New York,
 and elsewhere, the tea ships were either turned back
 without landing their cargoes, or the tea was stored in
 warehouses pending an appeal to the British Government.
 But at Boston more violent counsels prevailed. Three
 tea ships lay in the harbour, and preparations to land
 their cargoes were complete, when forty or fifty Bosto-
 nians, disguised as Mohawk Indians, boarded them at
 night, and emptied into Boston Har-
 bour the cargoes
 of tea, valued at
 £18,000.

The "Boston
 Tea Party" roused
 the British nation,
 which girded itself



"UNITE OR DIE."

A contemporary cartoon urging union between
 the colonies.

Britain resolves
 to coerce the
 colonies.

to quell the rebellious colonial spirit. Parlia-
 ment passed drastic measures. It closed and
 blockaded the port of Boston until the town
 should atone for the lawless deed; gave authority to the
 governor of Massachusetts to place a veto upon the acts
 of the Assembly, and sent a soldier, General Gage, to re-
 place Hutchinson, the civilian governor. Boston was prac-
 tically occupied by a military force. Meanwhile the colo-
 nies were arming. Virginia, in ardent sympathy with
 Massachusetts, invited a general congress to meet at Phila-
 delphia in September, 1774. Twelve out of thirteen colo-
 nies sent representatives, and the movement was at once so
 formidable as to invite concession from any one less obsti-

nate than George III. The Congress made firm demands that involved the repeal of some dozen British acts of Parliament. But neither side was yet willing to draw back, and, instead of yielding, the British Parliament passed further coercive measures. It had also furnished the colonies with a new grievance by passing the Quebec Act, which established a despotic government at Quebec to rule the territory recently acquired from France, and handed over to it a great part of the vast interior of the continent; the act also conferred large liberties upon the Roman Church. The colonies feared the same despotism for themselves, and resented bitterly the privileges granted to the old enemy of Puritanism, the Church of Rome.

In April, 1775, the colonial militia attacked at Lexington, near Boston, a force sent by General Gage to seize some military stores at Concord, and a bloody and indecisive engagement followed. A little later the British, with enormous loss to themselves, dislodged an American force which had gathered on Bunker's Hill, overlooking Boston. George Washing-

The beginning
of hostilities.




GEORGE WASHINGTON (1732-1799).

ton was made commander-in-chief of the American forces, and soon definitely began a bitter struggle which lasted for eight years. An attempt to draw the newly conquered Canada to the American side failed, after an unsuccessful invasion of that country. The Congress at Philadelphia declared in 1776 that America was independent of Great Britain. France, Spain, and Holland were ultimately in-

involved in the contest—France to aid struggling liberty and also to humble a recently victorious foe; Spain to

recover Minorca and Gibraltar; Holland to check British arrogance upon the high seas. Nor was Britain herself at one, for the Whigs held that the colonies were in the



INDEPENDENCE HALL, PHILADELPHIA,
Where the Declaration of Independence was signed, 1776.

right, rejoiced at the victories of the Americans, and in the House of Commons itself pronounced eulogies upon those who fell in their cause. The struggle was indeed a phase of Whig and Tory warfare, and victory for the Americans was also victory for the Whigs. Chatham died in 1778, and to the last raised his voice for concession that should save disruption. The ministry was fighting against terrible odds and the drift of war was adverse. In Europe, Gibraltar was besieged for three and a half years, and so certain was its fall thought to be that the capture of the fortress was actually exhibited on the Paris stage. In America, Washington, aided by his French allies under Lafayette, slowly won success often from adverse circumstances, and when, in October, 1781, Lord Cornwallis with his whole army surrendered at Yorktown to Washington,

American independence was really won. A little later Spain recaptured Minorca, but Rodney won in 1782 a



MEDALLION MADE AT PARIS IN
HONOUR OF BENJAMIN FRANK-
LIN, WHO NEGOTIATED THE
FRENCH ALLIANCE.

great naval victory in the West Indies over the French. Britain was forced to make a humiliating treaty. By the Peace finally signed in September, 1783, she recognised the independence of the American colonies. With some difficulty Britain saved Canada and Nova Scotia in North America, but she ceded Senegal and extensive possessions in Bengal to France, Minorca to Spain, and the port of Trincomalee in Ceylon to the Dutch.

Just twenty years earlier Britain had reached a high pinnacle of glory, and now she had been brought so low

Political
changes
resulting from
Britain's defeat.

chiefly through the obstinacy of a virtuous king who could not see the duty of self-effacement. Even in the moment of disaster George was brought with difficulty to treat with the Americans. When North, who found in 1782 that in and out of Parliament the government had overwhelming forces against it, advised concession, he was forced to resign, and no longer was counted among the friends of the king. With bitter grief and humiliation George finally accepted the inevitable, though it is said that he thought rather of giving up the crown, and he would not even see Rockingham, the head of the new Whig ministry which made the peace. Before it was concluded Rockingham died, and it was Lord Shelburne who signed the most disastrous treaty in the nation's history. Shelburne was not allowed long to remain in office. Charles James Fox, the profligate but brilliant son of Lord Holland, though one of Shel-

burne's cabinet, joined Lord North to drive him out. For years Fox had declared North guilty of treachery and perfidy worthy of the scaffold. By his change of front he lost Whig support; George III also hated him, and after eight months George was strong enough to dismiss the coalition ministry, and then he called upon William Pitt, son of the great Chatham, to form a government. Thus began Pitt's long rule. He was only twenty-three, but he had already the caution, self-control, and insight of a man of fifty. A Whig he always called himself, but he secured his most sturdy support from the Tories. The House of Commons refused at first to take him seriously; it was thought that the king had called a boy to office to tide over a difficulty, and that a few days would see his overthrow. Fox, Burke, and North assailed him without mercy; he was almost alone, but he proved their match, and won a sweeping victory at the polls, when he dissolved the House in 1784. The number of "Fox's Martyrs" who were defeated was 160, and that leader had only a beggarly following left. Though the Whigs had closed the American question they had solved the problem by accepting defeat, and for a long time still they were not to be allowed to rule England. Soon the terrible events of the French Revolution aided the forces of reaction, which continued to sway the British nation for forty years.

SUMMARY OF DATES

The prosecution of Wilkes in regard to No. 45 of The North Briton began in 1763. **The Stamp Act for America was passed in 1765**, and was repealed in 1766. **Townshend's bill for taxing tea and other American imports was passed in 1767**. The letters of Junius attacking the government began in 1769. Lord North became Prime Minister in 1770, and in that year all the American taxes except that on tea were repealed. The "Boston Massacre" took place in 1770. **The tea was thrown into Boston Harbour in 1773**. **The Boston Port Bill** closing the port of Boston **was passed in 1774**, and the Constitution of Massachusetts was also annulled. **The**

first Continental Congress met in 1774, and in the same year the British Parliament passed **the Quebec Act**. The battles of **Lexington** and **Bunker's Hill** and the **invasion of Canada** all took place in **1775**, and in **1776** was **signed the Declaration of Independence**. The French began in 1777 to help the Americans. Britain was also at war with Spain in 1779, and with Holland in 1780. **Lord Cornwallis surrendered at Yorktown in 1781** to Washington, in 1782 Britain acknowledged the independence of the United States, and **in 1783 Peace was made at Versailles**. William Pitt became Prime Minister in 1784.

BOOKS FOR REFERENCE

* Lecky, as in previous chapter. Trevelyan, *The American Revolution, 1774-1776* (1889). Fiske, *The American Revolution* (2 vols., 1891).

CHAPTER XIX

Society in England in the Eighteenth Century

THE social changes in England between the reigns of Elizabeth and George II were slight compared with those of the last half of the eighteenth century. *The spirit of change in the century.* If the earlier population showed any increase, it hardly exceeded the rate of 10 or 20 per cent. in a century; but the 6,000,000 people in England in 1750 had multiplied to 9,000,000 by 1800. Improved industry and improved agriculture were the causes of this development, which in the nineteenth century became so marked that the population increased fourfold. Most of the tendencies that we call modern the eighteenth century brought into operation. The abolition of slavery, the better care of the poor, the wider extension of the franchise were already keenly debated, but at the close of the century prolonged war checked the progress of these and other reforms. Yet though much bright promise was as yet unfulfilled, the age did see the practical end of religious persecution and parliamentary corruption, and a great extension of sober intelligence.

The England which George III began to rule in 1760 was vastly different from that which passed to his successor.

The bad roads. In 1760 a great part even of Essex was wooded and there were still vast stretches of forest. So slight was the movement from place to place that, apart from the few main highways, roads hardly existed, and in country parts wheeled vehicles were rarely seen. Even on the great highways there were ruts sometimes

four feet deep, and drainage was so bad that the roads were impassable in wet seasons; we have a description of a lady going to church over such roads in a carriage drawn by six oxen, and twenty-six miles a day was considered good average progress for stage wagons. Only once a month was there a coach from London to Edinburgh, and the journey occupied sixteen days. Travel was necessarily almost a monopoly of the rich, who went on long tours in their own carriages.

Few things affect the well-being of society more than facility of communication. Ideas as well as commodities

circulate when men move readily from one place to another, and the last half of the century saw great improvements. General Wade showed how important were roads when, after the rising of 1715 in Scotland, he built military roads across the



JAMES BRINDLEY (1716-1772).

Highlands, which helped to end disorder by making possible the rapid concentration of troops. Before 1800 many highways were built in England, and to meet the cost of keeping them up tolls were charged. The era of the railway had not yet come, but that of the canal had begun. The Duke of Bridgewater's engineer, James Brindley, planned a canal from the duke's coal-pits at Worsley to Manchester. The project which it involved

of crossing the Irwell by a high level aqueduct was ridiculed, but the canal was completed in 1761; the price of coal in Manchester quickly fell by one-half, and soon a network of canals existed in England that brought remote places within reach of cheap water communication, and

made it easy to carry the heaviest articles to all parts of the kingdom. About the middle of the century to travel became fashionable in England, and improvements in English life may be traced in part to the wider observation that travel involved. No continental state had as much personal liberty as was enjoyed in England, but France and Holland in particular had got rid of many barbarities that England still retained. Travelling was not easy. Ships had sometimes to wait for days, or even weeks, for a favourable wind. There were few quays for landing, and passengers were often lowered into open boats miles from shore.

The most marked changes of the last half of the century were in agriculture and in manufacturing industry.

The improvements in agriculture were mo-
Village
agriculture. mentous. In the reign of Elizabeth sheep farming was very profitable, and single land-owners had often flocks of more than twenty thousand sheep. Wool became in time less profitable; in the seventeenth century mixed farming gained ground, but until George II's time English agriculture was very primitive. The old methods of the mediæval manor were not yet wholly dead, and more than half of the cultivated land was still farmed on the open field system, under which the villagers worked in partnership. Villages had three great fields; each year wheat or rye would be sown in one; oats, barley, pease or beans in the second; and the third would lie fallow. Usually in each of the three fields a farmer had about six acres, and he had also about two acres of meadow, together with rights of pasturage and of cutting wood on the rough uncleared land. Until the harvest, he looked after his own acres, marked off in acre or half-acre strips by balks of bush-grown turf. The strips were often widely scattered in the great fields, and much time was lost in going to and from them. After the harvest the fences were opened, and all the villagers then turned their cattle into the fields.

The villagers united in this system formed isolated communities that supplied nearly all their own wants.

The village
community.

They shaped their own rude farm implements, carved from wood their own spoons, bowls, and platters, brewed their own beer, made their own homespun clothing, leather boots and harness. Rarely going from home, they saw but little of the outside world. The open field system, by forcing upon the tiller of the soil a varied range of industry made him more skilful with his hands than he is now, but not the less was it wasteful and unprogressive. It held every man down to the level of his neighbours. The narrow strips of land made thorough cultivation impossible, there was little drainage or manuring, and in the great open fields a dead level of uniformity in crops was inevitable. Nor could the live-stock make much advance. As the cattle of all the farmers were herded together, improved breeding was impossible, and diseases were readily communicated. Turnips and clover, so essential to modern stock-raising, were little cultivated, and for want of fodder only a fraction of the animals could be kept throughout the winter, and then in a half-starved condition. Moreover, at a time when agriculture was making tremendous strides, the small farmers had no capital to undertake great improvements. The names of Jethro Tull (d. 1741) and Lord Townshend (d. 1738) deserve honour from all interested in the cultivation of land. Tull found by experiment what is to us the commonplace, that for the best results the soil must be thoroughly worked and stirred. By this means he made his own land vastly more productive, and is really the pioneer in modern scientific farming. Townshend, who had been Walpole's colleague, but would not brook that masterful spirit, retired to his estate in Norfolk, and studied so successfully the cultivation of the turnip, that he came to be known as "Turnip" Townshend.

The new agriculture came at the right moment. British industry was developing, the population was increasing rapidly, and there was a ready market for food products. Probably the new tillage increased fivefold the fertility of the soil, but it destroyed the open field system. As the demand for bread and beef was keen, landowners put large capital into agriculture; they were anxious to secure all the good land for cultivation, and this meant the doom of the small farmer, who had hitherto been secure as the owner or tenant of a small holding. By the early years of the nineteenth century the open field system had well-nigh disappeared and the rights in the former commons had passed in many cases to private owners. For each case of inclosure of the commons a special act of Parliament was necessary, but in the first forty years of George III's reign about three millions of acres were so inclosed. The villagers were paid for what they gave up; land formerly barren soon produced rich harvests; the farms increased enormously in value, and if England was to feed her own population the change was inevitable. None the less did it involve painful results. The small landowner, the sturdy yeoman class, which had done so much in England's past, almost disappeared. The tiller of the soil, who before had his own land and garden, became merely a hired labourer. Sometimes by vexatious law costs and unjust treatment he got little for what he gave up, and inclosure for him meant robbery. The English farm labourer of to-day, sunk in stolid ignorance, and living often in sordid discomfort, is probably far inferior to the average cultivator under the open field system; it was an inevitable but high price to pay for improved agriculture. The very increase of population made the labourer's lot harder, for the problem of housing became serious, and insanitary overcrowding common.

Remarkable changes in mechanical industries accom-

panied those in agriculture. Before the eighteenth century cotton was little known in England, and when it first appeared every effort was made to check its use. Enraged weavers, seeing the woollen trade menaced, sometimes tore the cotton textures from the backs of ladies in the streets. Parliament also came to the aid of the woollen trade by enacting that all over six years old should wear on Sundays and holy-days woollen caps made in England, and that all persons should be buried in woollen. A law of 1722 forbade the wearing of printed calicoes, and in 1766 a lady was fined £200 for having a handkerchief of French cambric. Yet the cotton and linen industries grew. Adam Smith's *Wealth of Nations* appeared in 1776, and represented the new political economy, which urged that the state should leave all industry a free hand; and in time the cotton trade was to become vastly more extensive than the woollen. In the eighteenth century pottery-became an important industry in England, and silk weaving was introduced, though the home growth of the silk-worm did not prove successful. Money could be borrowed at three per cent, and thus cheap capital was at the service of great industrial enterprises requiring expensive machinery; and the increased use of machinery

The beginning of the Industrial Revolution. is the most striking feature of the industry of the eighteenth century. As early as 1712

Newcomen used steam-power, but it was not until 1765 that James Watt invented a steam-engine which could furnish power for factories. Side by side with this improvement came inventions that simplified and cheapened the textile industries; John Kay patented the flying shuttle in 1733; Hargreaves invented the spinning-jenny in 1764; Arkwright's spinning-frame came into use in 1771; Cartwright's power-loom in 1785. At the same time improved blast-furnaces and better methods in coal-mining, and a deeper knowledge of chemistry vastly widened the range of industry.


The extension of machinery meant the ruin of the small hand industries to be found in many poor households, and with the loss of livelihood in sight, the workmen showed a violent hatred for new inventions. Mobs sometimes went through manufacturing districts destroying the new machinery, factories were burned down, the inventors themselves often had to experiment in secret, and some even found it impossible to remain in England. Though a period of industrial transition always involves hardship, the use of machinery made commodities cheaper, enlarged their market, and increased the demand for labour. Yet the new conditions were less wholesome than the old. Instead of remaining in their own cottages, workpeople were now crowded into great factories, often amid unsanitary conditions. To augment the supply of labour, children were taken into the factories at a very early age, and by unwholesome toil were ruined in health. The increase in the industrial population also involved great misery when slack trade made employment scarce. In the attempt to give relief the state began, about 1795, the system of supplementing the wages of able-bodied men by weekly doles. Soon the principle was asserted that every poor family was entitled to an allowance in proportion to its members. Idle and industrious shared alike, and the system demoralized English village life for nearly half a century, until abolished in William IV's reign.

The laws of England were ill suited to the needs of an expanding society. Only in 1733 did an enactment come into force providing that legal documents should henceforth be in English only, and not in Latin or French. Further progress in intelligence is indicated by the act of 1736, which abolished the atrocious prosecutions for witchcraft. Law expenses continued to be enormous, especially in suits for small debts. Since legislators thought that strict enactments

The effect of
the Industrial
Revolution.

The state of
the law.

would prevent offences, and created new felonies with reckless indifference to human life, the laws against crime were barbarously severe. It was property-owners who made the laws, and they looked upon offences against property as the most heinous; to steal a horse or a sheep, to pick a pocket of more than a shilling, to steal goods from a shop, to destroy maliciously a tree in a garden, were all punishable with death; while graver moral offences, such as attempted murder, and perjury that might even lead to the execution of an innocent person, were more lightly punished. A servant who had wounded his master fifteen times with a hatchet in an attempt at murder, was executed, not for this offence, but for burglary in entering the room. Since the penalty for trifling theft was death,




JONATHAN WILD PELTED BY THE MOB ON
HIS WAY TO THE PLACE OF EXECUTION.

merciful juries and judges acquitted obviously guilty persons rather than inflict so terrible a punishment; undue severity thus caused crime to be condoned, not punished, and accused persons, relying on this forbearance, sometimes preferred to be tried on a capital charge. Usually it seems there were not more than fifty executions in London in the course of a single year, and when we compare this with the proba-

bly enormous number of thefts in days without police, we see that the law's rigour was more nominal than real.

Yet even this number of executions was ghastly. Every six weeks there was a procession of criminals through the streets of London for the long distance between Newgate and Tyburn, and noisy and ribald crowds flocked to see the last grim spectacle as an amusement. Sometimes the executions were horrible. The drop was not invented until late in the century, and the friends of the man who was hanging by the neck sometimes clung to his feet in order to hasten strangling.



A MAN WHIPPED AT THE CART'S TAIL FOR PETTY LARCENY, FROM CHARING CROSS TO THE HORSE GUARDS.

Until 1790 the law required that the execution of female criminals should be by burning. By selling convicts for a limited period, and sometimes for life, to work on the plantations in America, a punishment hardly less terrible than death was inflicted. The price was about £20 for each convict, and the slavery was as real as that of the negro. After the American Revolution criminals were transported to Australia.

The old method of discouraging crime by exposing the remains of criminals was still in vogue. Travellers entering London by the Edgeware Road passed rows of rotting corpses hung on gibbets, and often arrayed in full dress and wig. Grinning skulls of executed offenders lined the

top of Temple Bar. In other ways crime was made to seem odious. Men and women were flogged through the

The prisons. London streets, or fastened helpless in the public pillory, to be pelted sometimes to death by cruel and mischievous idlers. In the centres of population the prisons were crowded, and many of those confined were not criminals, but debtors held for debt; often the debtor's family remained with him in prison, and children were thus reared in the tainted atmosphere of the jail. To be sent to prison even to await trial was itself a terrible punishment. Trial was delayed sometimes for months, in remoter places for even two or three years; and meanwhile the unhappy wretch was herded with companions from the most depraved classes, was unable to observe the usual decencies of life, and was perhaps dependent even for food upon charity, for prisons were often private institutions kept for profit, and it was not yet the recognised duty of the state to feed those whom it kept in custody. The English prisons were probably the worst in Europe. John Howard, the great prison reformer, began his work in 1773, and has left on record descriptions of the horrible prisons of his time. Fetters were in universal use. Because of the tax on windows these were few in number, and the unaired dungeons, in which many prisoners spent the greater part of the time, had such a pestilential air that Howard's memorandum-book, carried through a prison, was tainted and unfit for use until he had dried it for an hour or two before a fire. After his visits his clothes so reeked with the prison smell that he could not drive in a closed coach, but had to ride on horseback. A terrible prison fever, like the present typhus, and peculiar to England, carried off more than the gallows claimed; judge and jury sometimes took the disease from sitting in the tainted atmosphere of the court-room where the prisoners were tried.

Yet, with all these penalties of crime, England was a lawless country. One chief reason was, that while crime was terribly punished, the means of preventing it were hardly studied. Well-organized policemen, who though not soldiers are yet a disciplined force, watch the streets of the modern city; but in the eighteenth century there were few constables, and soldiers were made use of only to quell disorder. During the Gordon Riots of June, 1780, a rabble of 60,000 closed in on the Houses of Parliament, maltreated members who tried to enter, and forced them to promise to vote for a measure to annul the recent relief given to Roman Catholics. Some troopers were called to the scene, but declaring that their sympathies were with the mob, they rode away, and for days London was given over to unchecked disorder; while a small body of policemen, acting with energy at the beginning, would probably have prevented the trouble. Even in normal times the populace was lawless. A London householder named Green was besieged for hours in his house by assailants with fire-arms, and no guardian of the peace appeared. Green himself escaped from the house, but his sister was dragged into the street and murdered. A mob of 2,000 persons, in broad daylight, stoned to death, near Bethnal Green, a person obnoxious to them, and, in spite of his entreaties for instant death, protracted his agonies for two hours. The streets of London were so unsafe that, as late as the end of the century, even royal persons were stopped and robbed, and a highwayman once dropped over the wall of Kensington Gardens and, with every expression of respect, took from George II himself, who was walking there alone, his purse, watch, and buckles. Until in 1792, when an armed guard began to accompany the mail-coaches, these were special objects of attack, and were often stopped in the daylight to have their contents pillaged leisurely. Smugglers landed their

The lawlessness
of England.

cargoes on the Suffolk coast, and in defiance of the forces of the law armed convoys sometimes escorted the goods into the interior. Piracy was still a menace to sea-going African and West Indian commerce. Early in the century a pirate named Roberts cruised the high seas with armed ships which he had captured, and he carried on bold depredations, until in 1722 Sir Chaloner Ogle won his knighthood by a clever attack on the little pirate fleet; Roberts himself was killed, and 52 of his men were hanged in chains at Cape Coast Castle.

The sudden growth of wealth after Britain's great conquests affected manners adversely. In the reign of Anne gambling was so widespread that an act of Parliament made transfers of property to pay gambling debts invalid. Gambling and drinking habits. George III had the tastes of a refined country gentleman, and forbade gaming in the royal palaces. But dreams of great riches infected the upper classes, and stakes at play were such that sometimes £100,000 changed hands at a single sitting. The state, if not the king, encouraged gambling, for every year there were public lotteries, and the evils went on unchecked throughout the century, with ruin and suicide as its frequent accompaniments; when only twenty-three, the sister of the unfortunate General Braddock hanged herself because she had gambled away everything. Gambling and excessive drinking encouraged each other. The upper classes drank wine in quantities that now amaze us. Dr. Johnson tells us that respectable people of his native Lichfield got drunk every night, and no one thought worse of them. For each head of population six gallons of spirits were consumed to one now. The common people drank gin because it was cheap; and gin-shops made openly the terrible offer that in them people might get drunk for a penny, dead-drunk for two-pence, and have straw to lie on for nothing. It was in this age that the sight of women frequenting public

bars became familiar in England, and it still amazes the foreigner.

Two practices showed the indifference of the times to human life. In spite of determined foes the slave-trade went on throughout the century, and nearly one hundred thousand negroes were carried annually in slave-ships amid conditions so horrible that about one-half perished or were permanently injured. In 1783 the master of the *Zong*, a British slave-ship, threw overboard 132 negroes. He claimed that a storm made this step necessary, but it was proved that sickness was raging among the negroes, and that, on the plea of a storm, they were destroyed, so that the insurance companies should have to pay for them. The case attracted general attention. William Wilberforce, aided chiefly by Clarkson and Zachary Macaulay, spent many years in attacking the trade, but not until 1807 was it abolished. Duelling, which also involved the needless sacrifice of life, still flourished. To kill in a duel was by law the same as murder, yet even moral leaders like Wilberforce thought the practice a social necessity in defence of honour.

When the Act of Uniformity of 1662 made it finally impossible for saints like Richard Baxter to remain in the Church of England, the Church itself lost strength while the persecuted non-conformists lost influence. With the toleration of William's time came also something like torpor over both the Church of England and non-conformists, and they showed little spiritual vigour in the first half of the eighteenth century: any approach to enthusiasm was frowned upon as in bad taste. Many of the working classes were practically pagan. In the Church there was still the evil system of pluralities, by which a single person could hold a number of livings, draw their revenues, and for a pittance employ curates to hold the serv-

Indifference to human life.

The state of religion.

ices in the neglected parishes. The result was that some favoured clergymen had very large incomes, while most had only £60 or £80 a year; often the butler had a better income than the village clergyman, who some-



THE SLEEPING CONGREGATION. (After Hogarth.)

times married a servant or the inn-keeper's daughter, and was on their social level. The evil habits of the time, the terrible state of the prisons, the gross ignorance of the masses, called for special zeal from the clergy, but until a great reformer arose little was done. John Wesley (1703-1791) led the most remarkable religious movement of the eighteenth

century. From reading Luther on the Epistle to the Galatians, he came, like Luther, to lay the chief stress in religious teaching on personal faith in Christ. He was himself an Anglican clergyman, but on account of his supposed mistaken zeal he was, in 1742, refused leave to preach in the church at his birthplace, Epworth, of which his father had been rector. He preached instead in the churchyard, standing on his father's tomb; hundreds were impressed by his words, and for more than forty years he continued the work thus begun. George Whitefield, another clergyman of remarkable eloquence,

aided him, until they quarrelled on a question of doctrine, but Wesley's great organizing zeal directed the movement. Their services were sometimes held in churches, but as often in the open air. Near Bristol Whitefield preached to ten thousand of the mining population. Both he and Wesley penetrated to the remotest parts of England, and their zeal carried them to America. In each year Wesley travelled, usually on horseback, about six thousand miles, and preached about a thousand times. His life is an amazing record of hard work. His own desire was that his societies should remain voluntary organizations within the Church of England; he held no services during church hours, and at his meetings no sacraments were administered. But soon after his death the "Methodists" severed their connection with the Church of England, and became an independent organization. His work reached the classes hitherto neglected, and was a powerful factor in English civilization. Other forces promoted the same end. Before the close of the century Sunday-schools were established everywhere, Robert Raikes, of Bristol, being the leader of the movement.



JOHN WESLEY (1703-1791).

Though when Bacon wrote, under James I, he doubted whether English could become a literary tongue, and preferred to write in Latin, by the end of the eighteenth century English literature could show an imposing array of names. Shakespeare's work must have helped to dispel Bacon's doubt, and when John Milton (1608-1674) followed quickly upon the heels of Shakespeare, English poetry

Literature in
England.

could invite comparison with the best classical models. Milton's great poem, *Paradise Lost*, was written avowedly to justify the ways of God to men.



JOHN MILTON (1608-1674).

John Bunyan's *Pilgrim's Progress* is the work of an unlettered man in the simple language of the people, yet it is literature of the best kind, and he and Milton, writing in the same period, express, each in his own way, the deep religious spirit that marked the seventeenth century. Jeremy Taylor and Richard Baxter, also contemporaries, deal with similar high themes. But in

that age not all who could write were pondering the ways of God. The age of Charles II was marked by reaction against Puritan ideals, and the court circle, though polished, was cynical and dissolute. The drama, discouraged under the Puritan *régime*, revived, but the old plays of the age of Shakespeare no longer appealed to the prevailing taste; not tragedy, but comedy, flourished, and it was on the French model, depicting scenes from higher society in its worst phases. Fortunately reaction was confined to the upper classes. The old Puritan spirit still survived: Milton's chief work was done after the Restoration, and Bunyan's devout allegory contains a vivid picture of middle-class life at the time. In the circle of court writers Dryden's is the chief name. He wrote plays, but he did



JOHN DRYDEN (1631-1700).

more: he laid the foundation for the rational, concise, and effective poetry that remained the fashion until the death of Pope in the next century, and he developed a flexible style in English prose that is in striking contrast with the stately and poetical periods of earlier writers. Notwithstanding this perfection of form, both the poetry and prose of Dryden are commonplace. But the circle of readers was much wider than ever before. We find in the time of Charles II the first great booksellers: Jacob Tonson, Dryden's publisher, was able to pay large sums to authors, though the chief method of sale was through subscriptions received before publication. In the first half of the eighteenth century we find the climax of the earlier literary movement. Pope was a close imitator of Dryden; and his poetry, with little imagination or emotion, but highly finished, appealed to the refined and cultivated of his time. The age saw the beginning of the periodical press, made immortal by



ALEXANDER POPE (1688-1744).

Addison and Steele in the *Spectator*; Swift and Defoe, who were great pamphleteers, raised political controversy to the level of literature, and before the middle of the century Richardson and Fielding produced the first English novels. Dr. Johnson is important to the age as critic and moralist, and he became its dictator in regard to style. The number of readers steadily increased, and new forces were appearing in society. Methodism, valuing not dogma but personal experience, brought emotion and mysticism into religion, and poetry felt the same spirit.

After Pope's death there was a marked transition. A deep feeling for nature is already visible in Gray and Goldsmith; in Cowper it has become delight in quiet contemplation, while in Burns it is united with a protest against the wrongs which man inflicts upon man. The age saw the first great historical writers, the pioneers of the modern historical method of study: in both judgment and literary style Edward Gibbon still stands first among English historians. Hume wrote history, but his fame rests chiefly upon his work in philosophy.

Little that is original or creative is to be found in English architecture since the Tudor age. When London was burnt in 1666, Sir Christopher Wren, as
Art in England. the leading architect, had a great opportunity. He replaced the old St. Paul's Cathedral, which had been Gothic, by the present structure in the classic style and with a great dome; many of the London churches are also due to him. Classic pillars and columns prevail in most of the great buildings of the eighteenth century. The artists, Vandyke, Lely, and Kneller, who from the days of Charles I onward succeeded each other as portrait painters; were all of foreign birth; only in the eighteenth century did England herself, for the first time, produce artists who are truly great. Sir Joshua Reynolds and William Hogarth are the two best known, but Gainsborough, Romney, West, Lawrence, Raeburn in portraits, and Richard Wilson in landscapes, are also illustrious. It is to Hogarth's almost brutal fidelity that we owe our most vivid pictures of the coarseness of the eighteenth century.

During the greater part of the century education made little progress. That of the poor was left to the different churches; in England it was still a
Education and the professions. dogma that to educate the people was no business of the Government. No national system of instruction appeared until the next century, while in Prussia, as early as in 1717, Frederick William I

made education compulsory, and opened hundreds of schools for the poor. The English universities were in a torpid condition, and did more to furnish comfortable livings for their officials than to enlighten their students. Though making progress, the practice of medicine was still hampered by tradition. During the century, Guy's and other great London hospitals were founded, but by most practitioners disease was still considered a mark of excessive strength which required frequent blood-letting. Smallpox was the most baneful malady of the time, and in one year carried off more than three thousand victims in London. To be ill was considered indelicate, and George II's queen, Caroline of Anspach, let a mortal disease run its course rather than speak of it. Other professions were as backward as medicine. The officers of the army were badly trained. Already was the jest heard that Britain had "an army of lions led by asses"; but the common soldiers, who were the "lions," were often the jail-birds, tramps, and loafers of the land, and the alarm of a Highland invasion in 1745 threw them and the rest of England into a panic. Even with this material able officers could do much, but Wolfe and Clive are the only famous names in British military history between Marlborough and Wellington. Most of the officers of the navy were so rough as to be unfit for the society of the drawing-room, and their men, often seized by the press-gang and forced to serve, were brutalized by hard treatment and bad fare. Many were the horrors of mismanagement. During the Seven Years' War only 1,512 men were killed in active duty in the navy, but the almost incredible number of 133,708 perished by disease or were reported missing, though the total number in the service at this time was only 184,893. Yet it was this badly managed army and navy that won the greater part of the present British Empire. Victories in peaceful enterprise as well as in war the navy gained. Captain Cook's voyages to the

far East began in 1768. They added New Zealand, Australia, and other regions to the British domain, and finally completed the cycle of oceanic discovery.

The comforts of every class had greatly increased. Even the poor now drank tea, and they lived well before the high prices of the last decade of the century. They had potatoes, turnips, carrots, and cabbage, wheaten bread, and frequently beef or mutton. In the fashionable world the dinner was now as late as five, though conservative Oxford still dined



GENTLEMAN'S COSTUME AT
THE BEGINNING OF THE
EIGHTEENTH CENTURY.
(Portrait of John Law.)

at twelve or one. Poor guests complained that when they dined with a great man his servants drew up in a line at the exit, each expecting a tip, and often these "vails" made it impossible to accept hospitality. Women's dress was not radically different from what it is now, though their head-dresses were so elaborate that they kept them undisturbed for days, and could thus lie down only with discomfort. Until towards the end of the century men still wore long powdered hair and wigs, and dressed in bright colours, with rich cuffs and frills of lace; but about 1783 Charles James Fox, who was a leader in fashion as well as in politics, by way of a return to republican simplicity, began to dress less elaborately. Those who spoke in the House of Commons gradually ceased to wear court dress and swords, bishops left off their purple and the lower clergy their cassocks. Before the century closed venturesome youth cut its hair short. By that time to carry an umbrella in the street no longer attracted attention, though when this was first done a jeering crowd was

likely to follow the innovator. Manners became less formal and the phrases of courtesy less studied. But distinctions of rank, which have yielded so much to the freer movement of the era of steam and electricity, were still marked. With a few strictly defined exceptions, unless a man had a freehold of £100 a year or a leasehold of £150 he might not fish or hunt in his own grounds. The nobility held aloof from the country gentlemen, and really ruled the country: the younger Pitt was himself the only Commoner in the ministry when he first took office, and even he was the son of a peer. It mattered not how rich men engaged in trade had grown, George III refused to make them peers. But the landed interest was no longer the only powerful one in the state, and riches were passing to the trading classes. To the amazement of some, tradesmen now kept private carriages. The old system by which apprentices lived in the houses of their masters died out, and private life was more completely separated from business.

In eighteenth-century England were working strong recuperative forces. There were gross abuses, because the few who made up the privileged classes were able to keep the good things of office and to act selfishly. But a sound public opinion was growing, and no age has seen more remarkable spiritual and intellectual awakenings. In 1786 the House of Commons impeached Warren Hastings for injustice in his government of India. The trial lasted for nearly six years. Hastings was acquitted, but the case showed that the British public demanded fair treatment of subject races. Much of this bright promise of the time was checked by the French Revolution, and it was only after 1830, when reaction had run its course, that many ideals, already proclaimed in the eighteenth century, were reached.

The constructive forces of the age.

BOOKS FOR REFERENCE

* Lecky, as in previous chapters; * Trevelyan, *Early History of Charles James Fox* (1899); Stephen, *History of English Thought in the Eighteenth Century* (2 vols., 1902); Abbey and Overton, *The English Church in the Eighteenth Century* (1887); * Boswell, *Life of Johnson* (many editions); Wesley's *Journal* (selections from) (1902); * Southey, *Life of Wesley* (many editions). (See also the works named in Traill, *Social England*.)

CHAPTER XX

The Era of the French Revolution

(1789-1815—26 years)

George III; born 1738; succeeded 1760; died 1820

The era is the most dramatic in modern history. In 1789 financial distress led M. Necker, the Finance Minister of Louis XVI of France, to call together the States General. No meeting of the representatives of the nation had been held for one hundred and seventy-five years, and there was much excitement when the 1,200 members (600 chosen by the Third Estate or Commons, 300 by the clergy, and 300 by the nobility) came together in May. The three orders soon united in one chamber to form a National Assembly or Parliament, which seized control of the Government. The Paris mob's destruction, on July 14, 1789, of the Bastille, an almost disused prison turned into an arsenal, was the signal for violent revolution. In September, 1791, a limited monarchy was set up, but war soon broke out between France and Austria allied with Prussia; the king was overthrown, and in September, 1792, France became a republic. The revolutionists declared war on all monarchies, sent Louis XVI and his queen, Marie Antoinette, to the scaffold, and inaugurated a Reign of Terror to frighten their enemies into inaction: hundreds were executed, and many more driven into exile. In 1793 Britain joined in the war against France. It continued for many years; and inevitably, to unite and direct the powers of France, a military dictator rose. Napoleon Bonaparte, one of the world's great military geniuses, seized supreme power as First Consul in 1799; he made himself hereditary emperor in 1804, and, like earlier emperors, soon aimed at world-wide supremacy. By the Treaty of Tilsit in 1807, France and Russia united to dominate Europe, and tried to destroy Britain by stopping her trade with the Continent, but her command of the sea made her stronger than they. Because Russia was being ruined by the loss of trade, France and Russia quarrelled in 1812, and Napoleon led a great army to Moscow. His disastrous retreat was followed by

the events that resulted in his final lonely exile to St. Helena in 1815. Nearly every country in Europe was profoundly affected by his career. He was more than a military conqueror; he reorganized the whole system of government in France, and there and in other states destroyed abuses in a sense that made him the pioneer of an era of great progress.]

THE minister who had to face the difficulties caused by the upheaval in France was Pitt. In an age lax in

The character
of the younger
Pitt.

morals he was pure and austere, and the country believed with justice that he was an unselfish patriot. He remained poor all his

days. Soon after he took office a sinecure of £3,000 a year for life fell within his gift. Every one supposed that he would take it himself, but it went instead to the blind Colonel Barré. Friends in the city of London once offered him a gift of £100,000, the king at another time £30,000; but he rejected both proposals. He wished to marry, and his poverty forbade it; bailiffs were sometimes in pos-

session of his house, and he died a bankrupt. This complete disinterestedness impressed the people, accustomed to the jobbery of the Whig families. Pitt had resolution, patience, unflinching courage, unruffled temper, and the pride without the arrogance of his father. Both were great orators. Critics complained that the younger Pitt was cold and formal in manner, and that his thought never rose above mediocrity; in this he was



WILLIAM PITT (1759-1806).

inferior to Chatham, but he had an amazing dexterity with words that won many a triumph in Parliament. His avarice of power would brook no rivalry; his colleagues were afraid of and obeyed him. He showed his disdain of the aristocracy that had so long ruled the country by

almost swamping it with new peers: no less than one hundred creations or promotions were due to him, and he frankly said that every one with £10,000 a year ought to be a peer. Pitt reformed many political abuses. He introduced a better system of keeping and auditing the public accounts. For instance, the customs duties were so intricate that almost no one understood them, and in the customs were nearly two hundred sinecures, extracting from the Treasury some £45,000 a year. Pitt swept away these abuses, and vastly improved and simplified the daily business of government. Under him at last disappeared direct parliamentary corruption, as practised by Walpole and by George III. But for improvements that caused keen opposition Pitt had little taste: though he spoke against the slave-trade, he made no serious effort to end it; he was conscious of the brutalized condition of masses of the population, but is the author of no great social reforms. The heroism of self-sacrifice was not in his nature; he loved power and avoided measures that imperilled it. Deep drinking may account for the inferior quality of his later as compared with his earlier career; his friend Wilberforce mourned in the older Pitt the anxious, diseased face, the shaking hand, the features red and bloated with wine.



CHARLES JAMES FOX
(1749-1806).

The events accompanying the outbreak of revolution in France in 1789 caused profound concern in England.

War with
revolutionary
France.

France, the great peace disturber, was now so occupied by domestic affairs that Pitt hoped Europe would be free from war. Fox expressed generous sympathy with the struggle for liberty, while his chief friend, Burke, was filled with alarm.

Hundreds of French *émigrés* soon found refuge in England, and of their wrongs Burke made himself the spokesman. He quarrelled with Fox upon this issue, and their long friendship was broken. The massacres of September, 1792, in Paris, filled Europe with horror. The Church of England was alarmed by the spoliation and ruin of the sister Church in France; the friends of monarchy saw the very foundations of government assailed by a warlike republic. Between extremes on both sides it was not easy to keep the peace, and on February 1, 1793, war broke out between France and Great Britain. From the vortex of this war Pitt never really emerged, and it changed the whole character of his policy. He really loved peace, but many Whigs, led by Burke, agreed with the Tories that war was necessary; they gave Pitt's policy their support, and he came to be considered a warlike minister and the friend of despotic rule. To check sympathy with France he applied



EDMUND BURKE (1729-1797).

coercion with great severity. One Hudson, for toasting the French Revolution, was fined £200 and sent to prison for two years. For the eight years from 1794 Pitt kept the Habeas Corpus Act suspended. In 1797 the Bank of England was obliged to stop specie payments, and liberty and financial credit were both, Fox said, on the verge of ruin in England. Largely as a result of mismanagement, in 1797 a formidable

mutiny broke out in the fleet, and for a time it looked as if the sailors at Spithead and the Nore would turn the ships' guns on the forces of the British government, but by mingling conciliation with rigour order was restored.

Though domestic reform made little progress, the era of Pitt's supremacy is momentous in the naval annals of Britain, since she then attained the goal for which she had long been striving, that of undisputed command of the seas. In 1794 Lord Howe defeated the French fleet which was stationed at Brest; in February, 1797, Jervis, with Nelson as his chief lieutenant, destroyed the Spanish fleet off Cape St. Vincent, and in October Duncan used the recent mutineers at Spithead and the Nore to destroy finally at Camperdown the naval power of Holland, England's old rival on the sea. In 1798 Napoleon Bonaparte took an army to Egypt, hoping by conquering that country to have a basis for overthrowing the British in India and ultimately to overrun Europe by attacking it in the rear. Though Egypt was soon at his feet, his communication with Europe was cut off by the British fleet. Nelson, after a terrible struggle, destroyed the French ships drawn up in Aboukir Bay at one of the mouths of the Nile, and Bonaparte's army was left isolated in Egypt without the means to return to France. A little later, when in coalition the northern powers—Russia, Sweden, and Denmark—armed themselves to resist Britain's practice of stopping and searching neutral ships for the goods of an enemy, she acted with great decision. In 1801 Nelson attacked and destroyed the Danish fleet before Copenhagen, and after this few ships were left to meet the British upon the sea. The Peace of Amiens in 1802 proved futile; war broke out again in 1803, and Napoleon then saw that if he would mas-



HORATIO, VISCOUNT NELSON
(1758-1805).

ter Europe he must conquer Britain. In 1804 he assembled a great army at Boulogne, with a numerous flotilla of transports to carry the troops to England. Meanwhile Pitt had been driven from office for a time on the question of greater liberty for Roman Catholics in Ireland. But Addington, his successor, was not the man to face the acute situation which France's plans caused, and on May 10, 1804, Pitt became once more Prime Minister. Having united with Fox and Shelburne in attacking Addington's ministry, he wished them to come into office with himself, that the country should face the foreign



NAPOLÉON BONAPARTE
(1769-1821).

foe with something like unanimity. But to Fox, George III, who had recently recovered from one of the attacks of insanity that haunted him always, was hostile, and Fox generously consented to be left out of the new ministry. Pitt made a coalition with Russia, Austria, and Sweden against France, and Britain again did great things on the sea. Nelson attacked the French and Spanish fleets off Cape Trafalgar,

near Gibraltar, on October 21, 1805, and destroyed them both, but, though the victory made British supremacy upon the sea final, in England there was as much sorrow as joy, for Nelson fell at Trafalgar. Without a fleet Napoleon despaired of invading England; he withdrew his army from Boulogne, and with marvellous rapidity won compensation for the failure of his naval forces by new victories on land. On December 2 he met the Austrian and Russian emperors on the field of Austerlitz, gained a complete victory, and soon forced Austria to sign the Treaty of Presburg, recognising him as King

of Italy, making him supreme in Germany and bringing to an end the now worn-out figment of the Holy Roman Empire.

Austerlitz killed Pitt. He was ailing and had gone to Bath for a change, and the shock of the fatal news drove his gout to some vital organ. He travelled wearily to London with the heavy burden upon his mind of having failed to check the conquering sway of Napoleon in Europe. As he entered his villa at Putney his eye rested upon a map of Europe. "Roll up that map," he said, "it will not be wanted these ten years." On January 23, 1806, he died, with a lament for his country upon his lips. To many it seemed as if Pitt's whole career was a deplorable failure. No doubt under him domestic reform in any large sense stood still, and on this ground Fox refused to support a motion in Parliament declaring the dead leader an "excellent statesman." Yet the purity of Pitt's conduct, the higher tone which he gave to English public life, his strength and courage in an era of unparalleled danger, all mark him as a really great force in the history of his country.

When Pitt was gone George III accepted the inevitable and consented that Fox should hold office. In Shelburne's "Ministry of All the Talents" Fox took charge of foreign affairs. He had long protested against the war, but soon he, like Pitt, saw that it must go on. Napoleon crushed Prussia at Jena and Auerstädt in October, 1806, and then announced what he thought the master-stroke of his policy. From his enemy's capital he issued in November, 1806, the Berlin Decree, which forbade not only France and her allies, but also neutral powers, to trade with Britain, declared all her ports in a state of blockade and that her ships must not enter continental harbours. Without a warship that dared venture from port it was arrogant folly to make such a declaration. Britain retaliated with the Orders

The death of
Pitt.

Britain and the
Continental
System.

in Council of 1807, which declared that she would seize the vessels of any nation that attempted to enter the ports of France and her allies without first touching at a British port. Napoleon answered in the Milan Decree that he in turn would seize vessels which obeyed the British mandate. He made at Tilsit, in 1807, a treaty with the young Czar Alexander I, which included Russia in what was called the "Continental System" for destroying British trade. The attempt to ruin Britain by this system failed. Her command of the sea enabled her to replenish her own markets from all parts of the world, and at the same time to starve those of continental states, which could hardly send a ship from port, and were dependent upon Britain for such commodities as tea, coffee, and other necessities. In 1807, lest the Danish fleet should fall into Napoleon's hands and give him sorely needed ships, Britain bombarded Copenhagen and seized the ships of that neutral power. Her trade grew and she was prosperous, while the Russian landowners were being ruined for want of a market, and the people of France and Italy were forced to pay high prices owing to the failure of supplies through the blockade of their ports. Such was Britain's commercial supremacy that even the soldiers who fought under Napoleon are said to have worn uniforms of British cloth.

Little need be said of the successive English ministries that carried on the struggle. Pitt's great rival, Fox, died in office in 1806, and him Shelburne's ministry did not long outlive; when they proposed to permit Roman Catholic officers to serve in the army and navy, that sturdy Protestant, George III, dismissed them angrily, and an appeal to the country brought into Parliament a strong Tory and anti-Catholic majority. The Duke of Portland, who took office in 1807, was followed as Prime Minister by Mr. Perceval in 1809, and when in 1812 Perceval was assassinated by Bellingham, a lunatic, the Earl of Liverpool began a

The successors
of Pitt.

tenure of the office of Prime Minister that lasted for fifteen years. These three leaders were respectable mediocrities. The policy of war was inevitable, and all that the nation could do was to give it efficient support.

When in 1808 Spain began the first successful revolt against Napoleon, Britain aided her, and this Peninsular

The Peninsular War and the fall of Napoleon. War revealed to Europe the military genius of Sir Arthur Wellesley, better known as the Duke of Wellington. Spain lacked leaders,

discipline, and equipment for organized war; she was rotten at the top, but her peasantry had courage and carried on a guerrilla warfare with resource. The French fought with desperate tenacity; in the early part of the war Napoleon himself commanded in Spain an army of 250,000 men, and in Soult and Massena had worthy successors. Again it was the command of the sea that gave Britain her advantage. When pressed



ARTHUR WELLESLEY, DUKE OF WELLINGTON (1769-1852).

by the French, Wellington shut himself up between the lines of Torres Vedras and the sea, across which he could always command supplies. Slowly the French were forced back out of Spain. Wellington won notable victories at Vimiero (1808), Oporto and Talavera (1809), and Salamanca (1812). He carried the fortresses of Ciudad Rodrigo and Badajoz by storm, and after the victory of Vittoria on June 21, 1813, was able to invade French soil. At the same time, after Napoleon's disastrous Russian expedition, in which he lost 300,000 men, the allies were closing in

on France from the north. Finally his own Senate declared against him ; the triumphant allies occupied Paris, and in 1814 sent the fallen conqueror to eat his heart out in the petty sovereignty of the little island of Elba.

The long struggle was chiefly one between Britain and Napoleon for world-wide supremacy, and both had treated with high-handed arrogance the young republic of the United States. She was the only important neutral trading power, and Napoleon's Continental System and the British Orders in Council made commerce with Europe for her almost impossible. But in America, Great Britain, not France, aroused the chief anger, since Great Britain alone was strong enough on the sea to check American commerce. She stopped and searched American ships, seized the sailors of British birth found upon them, and ruined American trade with European ports. Sometimes the British seizures involved bloodshed, and in the United States a powerful party began to clamour for war, with the practical aim of avenging their injuries by driving the British from Canada and securing the whole northern part of the continent. Though Britain cancelled the obnoxious Orders in Council, the American Congress declared war on June 18, 1812. The struggle which followed is important chiefly for its effect upon the national spirit on both sides. The Americans invaded Canada unsuccessfully ; the English burned the public buildings at Washington, but met later with a terrible reverse at New Orleans ; there was a good deal of fighting upon the sea ; but the Treaty of Ghent, December 24, 1814, gave theoretically no gain to either side. The war appeared fruitless, yet on the one hand it taught Great Britain respect for the young republic, and on the other confirmed the British possession of Canada.

After Napoleon's fall the chief European powers united in holding a congress for reorganization at Vienna, but the delegates were startled by the flight of Napoleon from

Elba. Already the Bourbons had made both the army and the peasantry of France distrust them, and there fol-

The Hundred Days and Waterloo, 1815. lowed for Napoleon the last brief enthusiasm of the Hundred Days. Wellington and Blücher, in command of the allied forces, met

him at Waterloo, and there brought his unparalleled career to a final close. The fallen despot spent his remaining years at St. Helena, the prisoner of Britain. She came out of the long contest with a new position and almost a new realm. If she had lost one empire by

The results of the war. the American war, she now acquired another.

She retained Malta in the Mediterranean, and also many former possessions of France and Holland, Cape Colony and Mauritius in Africa, Ceylon in India, Tobago and St. Lucia and part of Guiana in America. All these fell to her by the Peace of Paris in 1814. The secret of this extension of empire was Britain's command of the sea. The Dutch never recovered from the ruin of their navy at Camperdown, and their colonies were at Britain's mercy. Without a navy the French could no longer be a danger in India, nor could Spain hold her colonies in America, which soon became independent. Britain remained the only great colonial power.

The French Revolution produced one great constitutional change in Britain, for it was the cause of the Irish

The condition of Ireland. Union. Quiet had prevailed in Ireland for more than one hundred years after James II's defeat, but it was the quiet of exhaustion.

Most of those who could carry arms went into foreign service, and, as Swift remarked, the remnant of men who stayed in Ireland was as docile as women and children. The same hard law that prevailed in England against Roman Catholics was enforced in Ireland. No Roman Catholic might own a horse worth more than £5, or carry arms, or buy land, or practise law or medicine, or teach a school. If a member of a Roman Catholic landholding family

became a Protestant all the land reverted to him. Roman Catholic bishops and priests were forbidden to exercise their functions. The aim of the Government was to stamp out that religion entirely. Yet, in fact, instead of de-



HENRY GRATTAN (1750-1820).

clining, it grew. While a few turned Protestant for the advantages to be secured, by a law of human nature persecution made the Roman Church attractive and some of the poorer Protestants joined it. But not only on religious grounds did England oppress Ireland. Under the narrow mercantile theories which prevailed throughout the seventeenth and a part of the eighteenth centuries, it was thought that Ireland's prosperity would injure England, and when Ireland, a graz-


ing country, began to build up an export trade in cattle which seemed to endanger the profits of the English farmer, this exportation from Ireland was forbidden. Then the Irish turned to sheep-growing, and began to export woollen products; but when this trade was becoming important it also was stopped. The changes threw many out of employment, and since Ireland's commerce was reduced almost to nothing they were forced either to emigrate or to secure a bit of land as the sole means of livelihood. Every one must have land, and to get it the peasant promised impossible rents, defaulted, and was thus at the mercy of the landowners.

The population of Ireland, now only one-seventh, was in 1800 quite one-half that of England, but the smaller island was tied hand and foot. Though the Irish Parliament met periodically to make laws, under Poynings' act

many English statutes were binding also upon Ireland, and Irish policy was settled not at Dublin, but at London. Moreover, with Roman Catholics rigorously disfranchised, the Lords and Commons of Ireland represented the dominant Protestant interest, not the whole people. But with


Grattan's Par-
liament and the
Union of 1800.

the American Revolution had come a great change. Then Henry Grattan led a movement to give freedom to Ireland, and, almost to the surprise of Irish patriots, the British Parliament, influenced by the disasters in America, passed in 1782 an act establishing Ireland's complete legislative independence. Great was the rejoicing, but before "Grattan's Parliament" had been well tested, the French Revolution inspired some Irish patriots with the hope of establishing an Irish republic. They were promised French help, and Theobald Wolfe Tone, Lord Edward FitzGerald, and others led in a bloody revolt, which broke out in 1798. As the sea was patrolled by English cruisers, France could send little help; with great cruelty and even outrage the English crushed the rebellion, and its effect was to convince Pitt that an independent Parliament in control of Irish affairs was a menace to Great Britain. He resolved to bring about the legislative union of the two countries, and Lord Castlereagh, the Chief Secretary for Ireland, took charge of the project. To few did it really appeal. The Protestants did not like it, since it would destroy the supremacy enjoyed by them in the Irish Parliament; and the plan was not acceptable to the Roman Catholics, who, even with their disabilities removed, could never hope to be supreme at London, as they might well become at Dub-




ROBERT STEWART,
VISCOUNT CASTLEREAGH,
AND AFTERWARDS MAR-
QUIS OF LONDONDERRY
(1769-1822).


lin. But Castlereagh silenced opposition with bribes of peerages, of offices, and even of money, and by means notoriously corrupt the Irish Parliament was persuaded to vote its own dissolution. On January 1, 1801, the union went into effect. Since that date Ireland, in lieu of having her own Parliament, has sent one hundred




1. England.




4. Ireland.



3. Great Britain.



2. Scotland.



5. Great Britain and Ireland.

THE UNION FLAG.

members to the House of Commons at London, and thirty-two peers to the House of Lords. Pitt had promised to remove some of the disabilities of the Roman Catholics in Ireland, but George III would not consent, and public opinion in England supported him; since they could not redeem their promises both Pitt and Castlereagh retired from office for a time, and the Union brought no immediate relief to Roman Catholics. To the present time its terms have been the subject of bitter controversy, and Irish patriots still hope to see their Parliament re-established at Dublin.

SUMMARY OF DATES

The French Revolution began in 1789, and War between Britain and France broke out in 1793 and continued with slight interruption to 1815. The mutinies at Spithead and the Nore were in

1797. **The Battle of the Nile** or of Aboukir Bay, which ruined Bonaparte's Egyptian plans, was in 1798. **The union of Great Britain and Ireland** was effected in 1800. Pitt resigned in 1801. **The Treaty of Amiens** was signed in 1802, but war against Napoleon broke out in 1803. Pitt was again Prime Minister in 1804. **Nelson** won but **was killed at Trafalgar in 1805**. Pitt died in 1806, and Grenville and Fox united to form a ministry pledged to try to make peace. They failed, and Fox died in September, 1806, eight months after Pitt. **The Orders in Council** prohibiting trade with France and her allies **were issued in 1807**, and **the Slave Trade** was also **abolished in 1807**. The revolt of Spain against Napoleon with the resultant **Peninsular War** began in 1808. **War** broke out with the **United States in 1812**. Napoleon, driven out of both Russia and Spain, was sent to Elba in 1814, but returned to France in 1815, to be finally defeated at **Waterloo on June 18, 1815**.

BOOKS FOR REFERENCE

* Lecky, as before; Martineau, *History of England* (1800-15) (1878); * Morley, *Edmund Burke* (1888); * Rosebery, *Pitt (Twelve English Statesmen)* (1891); * Mahan, *Life of Nelson, the Embodiment of the Sea-Power of Great Britain* (2 vols., 1897); Brialmont, *Life of Wellington*, translated by Gleig (1864); Oman, *The Peninsular War* (1902); Seeley, *Napoleon* (1886); * Rose, *Napoleon* (2 vols., 1902).

CHAPTER XXI

The Modern Era

(1815-1903—88 years)

George III	born 1738 ; succeeded 1760 ; died 1820.
George IV	“ 1762 ; “ 1820 ; “ 1830.
William IV	“ 1765 ; “ 1830 ; “ 1837.
Victoria	“ 1819 ; “ 1837 ; “ 1901.
Edward VII	“ 1841 ; “ 1901.

[In 1815 the Congress of Vienna went as far as it could in undoing the work of the revolutionary era, and the rulers of Russia, Prussia, and Austria soon formed what is known as the Holy Alliance. Its apparent aim was to unite the people of Europe in bonds of Christian brotherhood, but, directed by Prince Metternich, the Austrian minister, it was used mainly to check liberal government. In 1823 the limits of European influence in America were defined when President Monroe of the United States, supported by Great Britain, asserted the well-known “ Monroe Doctrine ” that the United States would oppose any further extension of European sovereignty in America. Greece revolted from Turkey in 1821, and after eight years won her freedom. In 1830 Poland tried to throw off the yoke of Russia, but was crushed. France proved to be still the storm centre of Europe. In 1830 she drove out the Bourbons and set up the liberal monarchy of Louis Philippe ; in 1848 she overthrew this monarchy, and Louis Napoleon Bonaparte became the President of a French Republic, which, in 1852, he transformed into an empire with himself as hereditary Emperor. The year 1848 saw all over Europe outbreaks in sympathy with that in France, and in favour of popular government (Kossuth in Hungary, Mazzini and Garibaldi in Italy, etc.). Most of them were for the moment unsuccessful, but the risings showed the strength of liberal opinion, and from that time there has been an ever-widening extension of constitutional rule in Italy, Germany, Austria, and other European states. A great exhibition of the triumphs of the arts and the sciences was held at London in 1851, and was thought to mark a

final era of peace. But soon Russia's challenge to Europe in the Crimean War, which lasted from 1854 to 1856, gave the signal for a renewal of bloodshed that made the last half of the nineteenth century a sanguinary era. The Indian mutiny began in 1857. In 1859 France and Sardinia attacked Austria and tried to drive her out of Italy. From 1861 to 1865 the Southern confederation carried on its war in assertion of the right to withdraw from the American Union; Prussia and Austria warred on Denmark in 1864, and on each other in 1866; the Franco-German War broke out in 1870; Russia was again at war with Turkey in 1876, and the United States with Spain in 1898, while between 1880 and 1902 Britain carried on minor wars in Egypt, the Soudan, South Africa, until the last great war with the Boer republics, which broke out in 1899. In this era of war remarkable political consolidation took place. France's war with Germany not only made her once more a republic, but also brought the German Empire into being in 1871 as a great federal state. The Kingdom of Italy, a union of formerly separate states, was completed in 1870, the British territories in North America united in 1867 to make the Dominion of Canada, while in 1901 the Australian colonies formed the federal Commonwealth of Australia.]

Trying though the ordeal was, the Napoleonic struggle purified Britain's patriotism, and in the end left her far from the terrible exhaustion of Continental Europe; her exports, only £27,000,000 in 1792, had expanded to £58,000,000 in 1815, and the national revenue showed surprising buoyancy. Yet distress followed the war. The debt had increased enormously.

Distress after
the war.

Peace threw out of employment thousands of sailors, soldiers, and workmen engaged in the manufacture of military stores. Of 644 ships in the navy no less than 530 were put out of commission. At the same time the increased use of machinery disturbed the occupation of many hand-workers, and deprived them of their accustomed livelihood. There were riots and violence. A half-crazy lad, William Ludd, destroyed a machine in a fit of passion, and certain of the artisan class banded themselves together as "Luddites," and caused great trouble to the authorities by their mania for breaking machinery.

But such fanaticism only injured their cause, and did not reach the source of the evils from which the nation suffered; William Cobbett, the most influential newspaper writer of his time, told the people in terse English through his widely circulated *Political Register*, that the breaking of machines could do no good; what was necessary was to get a reformed Parliament and a reforming government.

Long had endured the scandal of so-called boroughs, with two or three voters, sending two members to Parliament, while populous centres were without representation. Political power was still in the hands of a very small number of electors.

The need of
reform.

It is almost incredible, but it is true, that in all Scotland there were less than five thousand; the great city of Edinburgh had but thirty-three voters, and London's vast population had fewer than many a sparsely settled county. The notorious Wilkes had attacked these evils; the younger Pitt three times introduced bills to end them; and a little before the French revolutionary era the "Society of Friends of the People" was organized to effect reform. But the vested interests in the pocket boroughs were strong enough to prevent change, and, in face of the demand for reform when peace was restored in 1815, the Government acted very arbitrarily. Lords Sidmouth and Castlereagh, men of high character but narrow vision, made themselves the special advocates of repressive measures, and, believing apparently that England was on the verge of revolution, induced Parliament in 1817 to suspend the Habeas Corpus Act. On the other hand, in 1819, a great meeting at Birmingham, which still had no representation in Parliament, took the strong step of electing two members to the House of Commons. The ministry threw one of them, Sir C. Wolseley, into prison, and in the same year, when an immense gathering at Manchester also demanded radical reform, the Government,

in a panic, tried to arrest the leaders, and in the disturbance that followed the soldiery killed half a dozen people and wounded many others. At once to avenge these "Manchester Martyrs" became the rallying cry of reform, and Sidmouth and Castlereagh met it by passing through Parliament in 1819 the repressive measures known as "The Six Acts," which placed severe restriction upon the press, upon outdoor meetings, and upon keeping and using arms.

George III died in 1820. In spite of arbitrary conduct his personal character always commanded respect, but no one could feel this for his profligate and heartless successor, George IV, who had been Prince Regent since 1810, owing to the king's insanity. George IV was always unpopular, and was despised even by so ardent a supporter of the throne as the Duke of Wellington. When he became king, the Government's fears of violence seemed to be justified by the Cato Street conspiracy — a plot to kill Sidmouth and Castlereagh and other ministers, and overturn the Government. But the age for such plots had really long since passed away.

The absurd scheme was discovered, and Thistlewood, its leader, and four others, suffered death. Before the year ended, the chief dangers, which the close of the war revealed, were already past. Many of those out of employment had emigrated, and some of the unemployed naval officers, like Lord Cochrane, had entered the service of foreign states. Industry settled down to normal condi-

The succession
of George IV.



GEORGE IV.

tions, and the forces of reform organized themselves to effect the great changes now imminent.

The Tory tenure of office was not disturbed by the succession of George IV. Unseemly proceedings of the king against his queen, Caroline of Brunswick, agitated the first year of the new reign.

The decline of
Toryism.

She was accused of immoral conduct, but she was popular with the nation as against her depraved husband; nothing was proved against her, and ultimately the case was allowed to drop. Lord Sidmouth retired in 1822, and in the same year, with a mind unhinged by overwork, Castlereagh, who had become Lord Londonderry, committed suicide. Two of the friends of reaction thus disappeared from the political field. The Catholics were clamouring for political relief, the unenfranchised masses for a reform bill that should give them a voice in the nation's councils, and both demands grew steadily in favour. The Tory Lord Liverpool, a man of blameless character and of considerable executive ability, but by no means a great statesman, had remained Prime Minister for the long period since 1812, but when, owing to ill-health, he retired in 1827, it was apparent how weak the Tory party had really become. George IV called upon George Canning, the foremost orator on the Tory side, to form a ministry. But because Canning was tainted with the heresy of desiring relief for the Catholics, the Duke of Wellington, Sir Robert Peel, and other Tory leaders, would not support him, and he had to look to the Whigs for help. Perhaps Canning would have led the more liberal wing of the Tory party into new paths, as Peel did later, but he was Prime Minister only from April to August, 1827, when his brilliant career was cut short by death. Lord Goderich, a weak man, ill fitted to grapple with the stormy demands for reform, succeeded him, but Goderich could rely upon neither the Tories nor the Whigs. He retired in January, 1828, and then George IV

gave the Tories once more a chance to rule the country by calling on the Duke of Wellington to form a ministry.

The hero of the Peninsular War and the conqueror of Napoleon proved less great as a statesman than as a warrior.

Catholic relief. He was thoroughly honest, straightforward, and manly, but, perhaps owing to the long habit of military command, he had come to think that the upper classes possessed the inherent right to rule the state, and that it was the duty of the masses to obey. Canning and Goderich had made concessions to the Whigs, but at first Wellington would not hear of compromise. Yet even he was forced to heed the cry for relief to the Catholics. Under George III they had demanded the full rights of citizenship, but that vehement Protestant would not listen to their appeal, and because all officers must take the oath against transubstantiation, until the very close of his reign no Roman Catholic officer could legally serve in the army or navy. At length, in 1817, the Military and Naval Officers' Bill removed this test, and then Britain could avail herself in both services of the courage of Roman Catholic leaders. But the political disabilities still remained, and they robbed of all share in political life the great mass of the people of Ireland. The Whig party took up the cause of justice to the Roman Catholics, which became so strong that in 1825 the House of Commons passed a Catholic Emancipation Bill. But the Lords threw it out. The intolerant Test and Corporation Acts of the reign of Charles II, which placed oppressive burdens upon Protestant non-conformists, were still in force, and even their repeal the Tories bitterly opposed. Though in 1828 the Whigs, led by Lord John Russell, forced the Duke of Wellington to repeal these acts, the main question of complete freedom for Roman Catholics was still unsolved. In that year Daniel O'Connell, a Roman Catholic, offered himself in the Irish constituency of Clare as a candidate for the House of Commons. He fought the powerful landed

interest of the Beresfords, and was elected by an overwhelming majority. But the law would not permit him to take his seat. There was a furious agitation, and Ireland seemed ready to revolt, when the Duke of Wellington, who had the soldier's quality of knowing when he must retire from an untenable position, yielded, and in spite of George IV's opposition, and of considerable Protestant clamour, passed in 1829 the Catholic Relief Bill. All political offices, except the throne, the Lord Chancellorship, and the Lord Lieutenantcy of Ireland, were henceforth open to Roman Catholics, and their other disabilities were entirely removed.

George IV died in 1830, and the Whigs welcomed his brother and successor, the bluff and honest William IV, because, unlike George, he seemed friendly to reform. Although the demand for it had now become too insistent to be checked, the Prime Minister, the Duke of Wellington, would not yield. He declared that nothing better than the existing system could be devised; that the upper classes, as the chief holders of property, should control the state; and that a reform bill meant an attack upon property itself, and would probably be followed by confiscation. Such uncompromising Toryism alarmed the country. There was an election in the summer of 1830, and Wellington was defeated and forced to retire from office.

After a further stormy contest Earl Grey, the Whig leader, who followed Wellington as Prime Minister, succeeded in carrying the desired reform. In March, 1831, Lord John Russell, a member of the Whig government, introduced the Reform Bill into the House of Commons. Even in the House of Commons its second reading passed by only one vote and the House of Lords was resolutely hostile. Lord Grey appealed to the country, but, though an exciting election gave him a great majority, the Lords still rejected the

The succession
of William IV.

The Reform
Bill of 1832.

Bill; the king turned against it, and finally Lord Grey resigned. Then was seen how much in earnest was the nation. Riots broke out. Bristol was for days in the hands of the mob; many buildings were burned, there was a run on the bank, and popular anger against the privileged classes was bitter. Since the Duke of Wellington could not form a ministry, the king at last was obliged to restore Lord Grey and to agree to create, if necessary, enough new peers to force the bill through the House of Lords. This threat sufficed, and when the Commons passed the bill again in 1832, Wellington showed in the Lords his capacity for retreat, the Tory peers refrained from voting, and the bill became law.

The Reform Bill of 1832 caused something like revolution in English political life. One hundred and forty-

The effect of the Reform Bill. three old seats were abolished, and proper representation was at length given to Leeds, Manchester, Birmingham, London, and other populous centres. Formerly there had been but one polling-booth for each constituency; elections lasted forty days, and often were accompanied by riot and disorder. But now the election was to be completed within two days, and voting places were to be more numerous. Above all, though the rural qualification was still high, the franchise was extended so that those in towns who paid a rental of £10 might vote. The bill gave political power not to the working man, but to the small farmer in the country and the small shopkeeper in the towns. This reform of 1832 sufficed for a time, but it was inevitable that the still unenfranchised multitude should demand the right to vote, and before the century closed two further reform bills were passed, giving in the end political power to the labouring classes.

But these later changes were still remote when the first reformed Parliament met in January, 1833. The Prime Minister, Earl Grey, was a type of the old Whig

nobleman, honest and high-minded, but coldly critical of democracy, and with an approach to scorn for popular ebullitions; even Whig political leadership still inhered in the titled classes. But the new basis of political life was justified by the great measures which soon became law.

The abolition of slavery, 1833.

Slavery was almost the first of the evils attacked.

The slave trade, with its horrible seizure of negroes in Africa, had been abolished in 1807; slavery itself had long disappeared from the British Isles,

but it still flourished in the British colonies. The mantle of Wilberforce, the friend of the slave, fell, on his retirement in 1825, to Sir Thomas Fowell Buxton, and the Par-



WILLIAM WILBERFORCE
(1759-1833).

tients with crooked and distorted bodies who had been crippled and mutilated by unwholesome work when they



CHARLES, EARL GREY
(1764-1845).

liament of 1833 ended a long struggle by abolishing slavery in all British dominions. The nation granted £20,000,000 in compensation to slave-owners. There still existed a real, though not a nominal, slavery in the British Isles themselves. Children were forced by their parents or employers to work in factories from a very early age and for long hours. Visiting the hospitals of Lancashire, Lord Ashley, afterward the seventh Earl of Shaftesbury, found many pa-

were children. As a result of Lord Ashley's appeal, the Factory Act was passed in 1833. Though it fell far short of what he desired, henceforth no child under nine years of age might be employed in factories; children under thirteen might not be employed for more than eight hours a day, nor those between thirteen and eighteen for more than twelve. These conditions, still hard, were the best that Lord Ashley could secure in 1833, but in 1847 a new factory bill prohibited the employment of women, and of children under eighteen, in factories for more than ten hours a day.

The Factory
Act of 1833.

Another great reform was that of the Poor Law in 1834. At the end of the previous century, in a time of acute distress caused by the great French war, an act for relieving the poor had been passed by which even able-bodied men in work were entitled to charity on a fixed scale, in proportion to the number of persons in the household. The privilege, intended to give relief in a time of pressing need, was soon grossly abused, and the tax levied under the Poor Law became at length enormous; a property that in 1801 paid £11 for poor-rates, was forced by 1832 to pay £367, and at that time the annual levy for poor relief reached the immense total of £8,600,000. Yet the poor were really injured by the system. A man who refused to work could demand aid for himself and family, and was even better off than a steady workman trying to live by his own industry. Amid such conditions self-respect and thrift were at a discount, and change was necessary. The Poor Law Amendment Act of 1834 was sweeping in character. It confined to the destitute any help given; those aided were obliged to live in workhouses, and the system of doles, called outdoor relief, to people living in their own cottages was abolished. A change so drastic and sudden involved suffering, and outdoor relief was restored in the case of the aged and on occasions of great

Poor Law
Amendment,
1834.

necessity, but the reform of 1834 was effective in checking a great evil.

By a fate not unusual in politics, the statesmen who led in winning the Reform Bill were not allowed long to retain power. Lord Grey refused to yield to radical demands; some of his colleagues would not support his policy of severe repression in Ireland; and he retired in 1834. Lord Melbourne succeeded to the Whig leadership, and by 1835, though William

The beginning
of Victoria's
reign—1837.



WILLIAM LAMB, VISCOUNT MELBOURNE
(1779-1848).

IV tried hard to bring in the Tories, Melbourne was firmly in office. Two years later, in 1837, William IV died. He had, as "the Sailor King," affected the manners of a rough and hearty seaman, which won for him a certain popularity. But his simplicity bordered upon vulgarity, and his want of dignity and bursts of passion in an age making ever severer demands upon its leaders, had tended to weaken the prestige of the Crown.

His niece Victoria succeeded him when only eighteen, and her reign proved to be the longest of any British sovereign. She had been carefully educated for her high office, and took delight in its dignity and authority. By nature wilful, imperious, impatient, and self-reliant, she would hardly have appreciated the pity of Carlyle when he said, at the time of her coronation: "Poor little queen! she is at an age at which a girl can hardly be trusted to choose a bonnet for herself; yet a task is laid upon her from which an arch-

angel might shrink." She had inherited Whig principles, and showed upon coming to the throne a decided preference for that party, going even so far as to choose the ladies of her household exclusively from Whig families. The turn of the Tories came when, in May, 1839, the Whigs were defeated in the House of Commons, and Sir Robert Peel, the Tory leader, was called upon to form a government. He insisted that, lest there should be danger of biassing the sovereign's mind against her ministers, the ladies holding high posts in the queen's court must be in political sympathy with the cabinet. The queen resented with impatience and temper the proposal to part with her personal attendants on political grounds, though she had chosen them on that basis, and the result of her refusal to yield was that Melbourne and the Whigs stayed in office for two years more. But the queen was wrong. "It was entirely my own foolishness," she said later, and after 1839 the ladies about her were not chosen from any one political party.

In time the queen learned great tact and self-control, and she devoted herself to the work of government with exemplary industry. She married in 1840 her cousin, Prince Albert of Saxe-Coburg-Gotha. "She is as full of love as Juliet," said Sir Robert Peel; and the twenty-one years of her married life were very happy. Her husband was a carefully educated and high-minded prince, but his manners and bearing were German rather than English, and he was not liked by the English aristocracy. The queen always felt that the British people were unjust to him, and, after his lamented death in 1861, nothing pleased her more than evidences that he was at last appreciated at his real worth. While he lived he looked upon himself as the queen's permanent minister, and the policy of the Crown was directed, and very wisely directed, by him. Without doubt, the fact that the sovereign was

The character
of Victoria and
the declining
authority of
the Crown.

a woman tended to weaken her political influence, and Parliament steadily restricted the royal authority. It took away from the queen the control of the army; and the prerogative of mercy in the case of condemned criminals, which had hitherto been personal to the sovereign, was now vested in a minister of state. Prince Albert's share



VICTORIA.

in the work of government perhaps in itself tended to put the queen in the background, and after his death her lifelong sorrow at his loss made her reluctant to take part in great ceremonies; she rarely appeared at the opening or closing of Parliament, and the public mind grew accustomed to the idea that the sovereign played but a small part in political life. In private the queen expressed her


opinions with great vehemence; but the sinister methods of George III for making the sovereign's views effective in Parliament had passed away, and Victoria exercised only a slight influence upon public opinion. She wished to see Lord Palmerston defeated, but in face of this he was triumphant and always popular. She showed more favour to Lord Beaconsfield than to any other minister, but he was driven from power at a time when the royal approval was most marked. In the end, the queen frankly accepted limitations that no previous sovereign would have acknowledged. "I am bound by certain rules and usages," she said to Napoleon III. "I have no uncontrolled power of decision; I must adopt the advice of a council of ministers." The Crown still wielded great influence, but it was personal and social rather than political. The queen loyally carried out the

dictates of Parliament, and made no attempt to override the settled principles of the constitution. During her long reign she accumulated a mass of political experience which made her in some respects wiser than any of her ministers. In foreign affairs her influence and knowledge were remarkable. But her intellectual powers were not great; and though she was always interested in music and painting, neither in these nor in literature had she much insight. Nor was her outlook upon the wider world of politics very enlightened. She was the mother of a large family, and the interests of her numerous descendants constantly occupied her mind and influenced her opinions. Because herself related to so many European princes, she was never in sympathy with popular movements which threatened their authority. The thought of a united Italy did not appeal to her, and when the Poles strove to throw off the Russian yoke her sympathies were with the oppressors. But her personal character always commanded weight and respect. She was a devout Christian, and in tone her court was pure to the point of austerity. The bitter grief of her life quickened her sympathies, and she excelled not only in strength, but in the tenderness that won deep affection. Sorrow and suffering appealed to her woman's heart; and, in turn, devotion to the queen herself had a large place in the spirit of unity between the different parts of the British Empire that became so marked before the close of her reign.

The Whig leaders whom Victoria's accession found in power belonged, like the Tory leaders, with the exception of Peel, to the aristocratic classes. They were apt to think that with the bill of 1832 reform had gone far enough; and they had behind them no popular enthusiasm. Melbourne's retirement, prevented in 1839 by the dispute concerning the queen's household, came in 1841, when the Whigs were defeated in a general election. Sir Robert Peel was Prime Minister

Peel and the
Corn Laws.

for the five years from 1841 to 1846. At the end of his own career, Gladstone said that Peel was the greatest man he ever knew. It was high praise for one who in his time aroused keen enmity. The old Toryism was fast becoming impossible, and two of its ornaments, Canning and Peel, illustrated this truth. In times of crisis great minds follow principles rather than party; Canning broke with the Tories on the question of relief to the Catholics, and now close thought and study led Peel to attack the Corn



SIR ROBERT PEEL (1788-1850).

Laws. During the long French war British farmers had reaped great profits through the high price of wheat, and at the close of the war, in 1815, to keep up the price, an act was passed prohibiting the importation of foreign wheat until the price in Britain reached eighty shillings a quarter; colonial wheat, which was unimportant in quantity, might be brought in when the price reached only sixty-seven shillings. In 1822 a sliding scale of duties was adopted. When the price of wheat was low the duty was to be high, that the English landowner might be always free from the competition of cheap wheat. Radical reformers attacked these Corn Laws bitterly, and of course laid emphasis upon the injustice to the poor in making wheat dear to benefit well-to-do landlords. But both the Tory and Whig leaders supported the Corn Laws, and Lord Melbourne declared in 1839 that free trade in corn was the wildest and maddest scheme ever imagined. Richard Cobden's clear and forcible reasoning enlisted John Bright's great eloquence in the cause. These leaders joined the Anti-Corn-Law League formed in 1838, and soon their influence was felt. Rigid Whigs and Tories

still made light of the movement, but Sir Robert Peel saw that the existing system must be changed. In 1842 and 1845 he lowered the duties, not yet on corn, but on many other commodities, and when there was famine in Ireland in 1845 he begged his Tory colleagues to relieve the starving multitudes by removing the duties on corn. They refused, and he resigned.

But it was found that no one else could form a ministry; Peel resumed office, and the repeal of the Corn Laws was then certain. Supported by many Whigs under Lord John Russell, but amid the execrations of his former Tory friends, Peel carried through in June, 1846, the great measure by which, after February 1, 1849, wheat was admitted free with the exception of a registration duty of a shilling a quarter; even this duty was

abolished in 1869; it was reimposed in 1902, but so wedded was the nation to free trade that it was again abolished in 1903



LORD JOHN, AFTERWARDS EARL,
RUSSELL (1792-1878).

The repeal of the Corn Laws affected the protective duties on other commodities. After 1846 the principle of free trade was supreme in England, and by 1852 successive budgets had swept away every vestige of protection. The change to free trade opened British markets and vastly augmented British commerce, and the repeal of the old restraints had the indirect, and for the most part unconsidered, effect of giving the colonies complete control of their own tariffs. Britain no longer made laws regulating their trade, and they became more independent of the mother country;

The completion
of Free Trade.

some of them soon levied duties against her, but the wider liberty in the colonies removed all causes of discontent and really strengthened their attachment to Britain.

Peel fell in the moment of his triumph. In June, 1846, on the very day that the Lords finally passed the repeal of the Corn Laws, he was defeated in the House of Commons on an Irish question and resigned; never again, as it proved, did he hold office. Lord John Russell became head of a Whig ministry which endured until 1852. Lord John, though honest and painstaking, was in person shy and awkward, and not a very inspiring leader. His place in the Whig party was somewhat overshadowed by his Foreign Secretary and rival for the leadership, Lord Palmerston,¹ a man

¹ The use of titles in Britain is often puzzling to the reader. It should be noted that the possession of a title does not involve membership of the House of Lords; Lord Palmerston, for instance, sat in the House of Commons. All peers of the United Kingdom are members of the House of Lords, and may not sit in the House of Commons. But both Scotland and Ireland have their own peerages, whose holders possess titles. When the unions were effected it was provided that the Scottish and the Irish peers should elect a certain proportion of their number to sit in the House of Lords, but the peers of Ireland though not of Scotland are eligible for the House of Commons. Other persons with titles of nobility also sit in that house. The eldest son of a peer, such as the Duke of Devonshire, takes by courtesy one of the secondary titles of his father; the Marquis of Hartington, for instance, sat in the House of Commons until he succeeded his father as Duke of Devonshire. Younger sons of members of the higher nobility also have the courtesy title of "Lord," which is placed before their Christian names. Lord John Russell was the son of the Duke of Bedford, and in a case like his the title of "Lord" means little more than the title of "Mr." prefixed to other people's names; he signed his name simply "John Russell." But, in time, Lord John was himself made a peer of the United Kingdom as Earl Russell. Then he was known not as Lord John Russell, but as Lord Russell, and henceforth used the signature "Russell" without any prefix. When it is desired to give any one a title higher than Baronet, and yet not to make him ineligible for the House of Commons, he is usually created an Irish peer.

of commanding personality, who played a prominent part in British politics for more than half a century. Lord John took especial interest in domestic reforms (it was he who introduced the great Reform Bill of 1832), while Palmerston devoted himself mainly to foreign affairs, and his nickname of "the Firebrand" indicates that he was not wholly a minister of peace. "The Palmerstonian style" was famous in his day. With his simple, manly, and straightforward character, to say a thing, and to say it in unmistakable terms, seemed the wisest policy; writing privately to a British ambassador about Egypt, he threatened that Mehemet Ali "would just be chucked into the Nile."



HENRY JOHN TEMPLE, VISCOUNT
PALMERSTON (1784-1865).

But diplomacy, accustomed to studied phrases, was startled by Palmerston's vigour, and through it he brought the country more than once to the verge of war. The queen was in constant alarm while he was at the Foreign Office, but the minister, who always stood up for the national dignity, never lacked popular support.

Peel's break with the Tories long disarranged political parties, for it was rarely certain to which side of a question the "Peelites" would adhere. The breakdown of party traditions paved the way for the newer Toryism, which preferred to be called Conservative. It was ultimately organized on a popular basis by Disraeli, who brought back most of the Peelites into his party. The Whig party, too, underwent transformation. The older Whigs drew away from the extremists, who now agitated for the "People's Charter"—universal

The Chartists.

tion the "Peelites" would adhere. The

breakdown of party traditions paved the way for the newer Toryism, which preferred to be called Conservative. It was ultimately organized on a popular basis by Disraeli, who brought back most of the Peelites into his party. The Whig party, too, underwent transformation. The older Whigs drew away from the extremists, who now agitated for the "People's Charter"—universal

suffrage, the right of every man to vote; vote by ballot, to save the voter from intimidation; annual Parliaments, to insure continuous control of the government by the people; the payment of members, so that poor men could sit in the House; the abolition of a property qualification for members; and equal electoral districts, so that each voter should have the same voting power. After the queen's accession the "Chartists" kept up an active agitation for more than ten years. The Whig aristocracy had little in common with the clamorous artisan classes, and the party split into two sections, the more conservative Liberals and the thoroughgoing Radicals. Even the old party name has disappeared; there are still Tories, but no Whigs. When revolution broke out in France in 1848 the "Chartists" arranged to present a monster petition to Parliament. In alarm the Government ordered the Duke of Wellington to organize the defence of London, and 170,000 special constables were sworn in. But the Chartist leader, Feargus O'Connor, drew back, and the hollowness of the movement soon became apparent. The people had come to understand that not violence, but votes, would be effective; that some of the proposed changes were not desirable; and that reform was making progress. Chartism took in time the more sober form of Radicalism, in which it still plays a part in British political life.

For nearly forty years the peace that followed the fall of Napoleon was hardly broken in Europe. Greece, indeed, threw off the Turkish yoke, and in 1827 Britain joined France and Russia in checking the Turks by destroying their fleet at Navarino. Britain engaged in minor contests in other parts of the world. During the first half of the century her territory and influence in India increased greatly, and this was not done without the frequent use of military force against troublesome Indian princes. In China, to

Minor wars
to 1854.

from 1839 to 1842, Britain was at war to enforce her claims to the right to trade, and she had struggles with native races in both South and West Africa. But such contests did not greatly occupy the nation's thought or resources, and a long peace seemed certain. In 1851, for a glaring indiscretion in regard to Britain's relations with France, Lord John Russell dismissed Lord Palmerston from the Foreign Office, and this so weakened the Whig ministry that it fell in 1852. Peel had been killed in 1850 by a fall from his horse, and Wellington died in 1852. The Tories were not strong, and Russell's ministry was succeeded by a coalition of Whigs and Peelites under the Earl of Aberdeen, in whose cabinet Russell, Palmerston, and W. E. Gladstone, a statesman already conspicuous, had place. The ministry lacked the unity which a great crisis demanded, for in 1854 Britain became involved in a struggle with Russia.

After the fall of the first Napoleon, Britain had come to see that henceforth her chief rival was not France, but Russia. That huge empire held a great part of the shores of the Baltic and the Black Seas, and had the design of reaching the Mediterranean by the seizure of at least a part of Turkey; it reached, moreover, across Asia to the Pacific, and threatened to spread southward so as to menace India. No other state touched British interests at so many points, and public opinion grew extremely sensitive about the designs of Russia. In 1853 the Czar Nicholas made a proposal that Europe found alarming. Turkey, he said in effect to the British ambassador at St. Petersburg, is a very sick man: it is falling to pieces, and unless some wise plan is made there will be a scramble for the fragments. But if Britain and Russia act together they are strong enough to do what they like. Let them expel the Turk from Europe, let Britain take control of Egypt and Crete, mismanaged by the Turk, and let the European dominions

The causes of
the Crimean
War, 1854-'56.

of Turkey become independent states under Russian protection. The bluntly frank proposition, made by a man of obstinate and masterful temper, was intended as a guarantee of peace. The British cabinet, divided on the question, allowed the matter to drift, until the Czar thought that England would acquiesce in his plan, and went too far to draw back; while, on the ground that it was necessary to keep Russia from access to the Mediterranean, Palmerston did all he could to make war inevitable. He prevailed, and the Czar was at last warned that Britain



NAPOLÉON III (1808-1873).

would side with Turkey rather than with Russia. France, too, had her ground of quarrel with Russia. She was the protector of the rights of the Latin Church in Palestine, as Russia was of those of the Greek Church, and between these claimants there were acute disputes about the control of some of the holy places. In 1852 the Sultan had made a compromise which pleased neither side. Moreover, Napoleon III was anxious to play a great part in Europe, and when the Czar's plan to destroy European Turkey became known, he was eager that France and England should draw together to oppose it, and Austria half promised to join them. The Czar demanded that the Sultan should recognise his alleged right under treaty to be the protector of all the Christian subjects under the Turk, and when, by the advice of the British ambassador to Turkey, Lord Stratford de Redcliffe, the demand was rejected, Russia declared war, destroyed the Turkish fleet at Sinope, and invaded Turkey. In February, 1854, France and Britain issued an unheeded ultimatum to Russia; and not Austria, but Sardinia, the state in Italy most

eager to expel Austria from that country, soon joined them.

The allies were fighting for a bad cause, in the vain hope that Turkish rule could be reformed. They concentrated their forces upon destroying the great menace to Turkey, the Russian fortress and naval arsenal of Sebastopol, in the Crimea.

The course of the
Crimean War,

Owing to the long peace, Britain's army had fallen into a pitiful state of disorganization. Most of her generals were old men, who had lost the power to adopt new methods. Instead of setting out early in the spring of 1854, so as to work in the summer, the army was late in starting; it did not arrive before Sebastopol until the end of September, and was then totally unprepared for the bitter winter that soon followed. With food only a short distance away, troops starved because the transport broke down; they were without proper clothing; the sick were long uncared for; and an absurd system of red tape hampered the action of those who tried to correct evils. The British had about twenty-five thousand men, the French thirty-five thousand, and of those who fought in the war, 40 per cent perished. The siege lasted for nearly a year. Both sides fought with grim determination, and the Russians, not content to remain within their lines, made frequent sorties. The battles of the Alma, Balaclava, and Inkerman effected nothing decisive, and finally, in September, 1855, the attempt was made to carry the fortress by assault. The French succeeded in their task of carrying and holding the Malakoff and the Little Redan Towers; the British took, but could not hold, the Great Redan. But the partial success made Sebastopol untenable, and the Russians destroyed what they could, and left the blackened walls to the victors. The siege had cost something like one hundred thousand lives. Its anxieties killed the Czar Nicholas in 1855, and his successor at length yielded. In March, 1856, a treaty was signed at Paris, by which

Turkey promised reforms and Russia agreed to the humiliating terms of keeping no war-ships on the Black Sea and of leaving Sebastopol unfortified, obligations which she publicly repudiated when Europe was fully engaged in 1870. Her plans were checked, but Turkish misrule was only prolonged, and a British Prime Minister has since admitted that his country, in the language of sport, "put her money on the wrong horse" in the Crimean War.

Before the war was over its gross mismanagement had driven from office the Earl of Aberdeen, and the veteran Lord Palmerston, at the age of seventy, became for the first time Prime Minister, and remained in office almost continuously until his death, in 1865. His aggressive spirit led him to resent to the point of war an outrage upon the British flag in China. He was popular as the upholder of the nation's dignity, and an election gave him a new lease of power. But the troops which started for China found other work to do. The Indian Mutiny broke out in 1857, and the forces on the way to China were used to meet this more serious danger. The Mutiny itself was caused largely by the belief that the Crimean War had shown Britain's military power to be contemptible; in addition, modern innovations, like the telegraph and the railway, and supposed disregard by the British of Hindoo and Mohammedan religious prejudices, had alarmed fanatical leaders. There were terrible scenes of massacre. The defence of Lucknow and of Cawnpore serve still to inspire British heroism, and in the end the Mutiny was put down. In 1858, as a result of the Mutiny, the British Government at last took over the enormous power hitherto wielded by the East India Company; a Secretary of State for India is now a member of the British cabinet, and the Viceroy of India and his councillors are responsible to him and to Parliament. When the Mutiny was over Britain and France united to

The Indian
Mutiny.

humble China. They made peace in 1860, but only after Peking had been occupied and the Emperor of China had been punished for the treacherous murder of British subjects by the burning of his beautiful summer palace.

After the Indian Mutiny Britain's share in war was small until the outbreak of the great Boer War in 1899.

Later minor wars and dangers of war. But so vast an empire is not often wholly at peace, and there were many minor conflicts, with Africa as their chief scene. In 1868

Britain was forced to send an expedition to Abyssinia, in East Africa; in 1874 similar action was necessary in connection with Ashanti in West Africa. In 1882 the situation in Egypt, in North Africa, became acute when Arabi Pasha led a revolt against the Egyptian Government and imperilled the interests of that country's creditors and Britain's communications with India by way of the Suez Canal. Britain promptly occupied Egypt with a military force and put down the revolt; she has since administered Egypt's affairs, so that it may now be regarded almost as British territory. A revolt against Egyptian rule in the Soudan, led by a fanatical religious leader, the Mahdi, took the chivalrous General Gordon into that country to restore order for the Egyptian Government, but his forces were too weak, and he was killed at Khartoum in 1885; the Soudan was for a long time abandoned to the depredations of fanaticism, but in 1898 General Kitchener crushed the revolt and re-established the authority of Egypt. Though these wars were not of great moment, more than once the menace of war with formidable states

The Trent and Alabama affairs. darkened the horizon and called for tactful diplomacy. In 1861, during the civil war in

the United States, a United States cruiser stopped the British ship Trent upon the high seas and removed from her Messrs. Mason and Slidell, two envoys of the Confederate Government on the way to Europe. Imminent danger of war followed from this high-handed

proceeding, against which Lord Palmerston protested with characteristic vigour. On the other hand, a little later the United States had just cause to complain of the ravages to American shipping by the Confederate privateer *Alabama* fitted out at a British port. But in the end Messrs. Mason and Slidell were handed over to Britain, and, as a result of arbitration, Britain paid heavy damages for the *Alabama's* ravages; both acute disputes were thus settled by peaceful means. When Russia again went to war with Turkey in 1876 and had Turkey at her mercy, she forced her to consent to the Treaty of San Stefano, which practically destroyed Turkey in Europe and made Russia supreme in that region. Renewed British jealousy was aroused, and Disraeli, Earl of Beaconsfield, intervened in the same spirit that Palmerston had shown during the Crimean War. A struggle seemed imminent,

The Congress
of Berlin, 1878.

but a congress of the European powers was held in Berlin in 1878, and Russia modified her demands, while Britain guaranteed Turkey's Asiatic dominions, and occupied Cyprus as her reward; the result caused much talk of Lord Beaconsfield's securing "peace with honour." In 1895 great excitement arose when the German Emperor William II sent a message of congratulation to President Kruger of the South African Republic on his success in checking a filibustering raid into the republic's territory led by Dr. Jameson, who was thought by some to have the support of the British in Cape Colony. Though this menace of war was never very serious, a special naval squadron was put into commission by the British Government. In 1898 there was a more real danger of a struggle with France. The British had just re-

The Fashoda
incident, 1898.

conquered the Soudan, which gave them control of the Nile, when a French expedition appeared at Fashoda, on the upper Nile, with the aim of claiming French predominance in that region. But the

British insisted that this predominance belonged to the conquerors of the Soudan, and peremptorily demanded the French withdrawal from Fashoda. France was in no position to meet Britain upon the sea, and the demand was promptly complied with. These various incidents serve to show how sensitive the nations of Europe are in relation to one another's aims, and how real is the danger of war.

Of the latter part of Victoria's reign the most vital interest is not in war, but in domestic reform. Lord Palmerston's death, in 1865, in his eighty-first year, removed one who was no friend of radical changes, and it encouraged agitation for the further widening of the franchise. Palmerston's successor, Lord John (now Earl) Russell, was defeated by the Tories under Lord Derby in 1867, and it was a Tory government that passed the second great Reform Bill. Mr. Gladstone had introduced one in 1866, but could not carry it against the Tories. Yet, not without murmurs from his companions on the Tory side at the sudden change of front, Mr. Disraeli in 1867 passed a more advanced measure. Though voters in the English counties must still be owners or occupiers of holdings of the annual value of £12, all householders in the towns were given votes and the number of electors was enormously increased.

Disraeli, who, on Lord Derby's retirement through ill-health, in 1868 became Prime Minister, had a difficult rôle to fill. With the steady extension of the franchise he had so to popu-



BENJAMIN DISRAELI, EARL OF
BEACONSFIELD (1805-1881).

larize the Tory, or rather, as we may now call it, the Conservative party, as to make its policy acceptable to the masses of the people. He was enlightened enough to tell Queen Victoria that the Crown had nothing to fear from broadening the basis of the constitution, and perhaps the best tribute to his foresight is in the fact that since the even wider extension of the franchise in 1884 the new voters have with but little interruption kept Conservative governments in power.

Though Earl Russell lived until 1878, he retired from public life after the defeat of his government in 1867, and

Gladstone and
Disraeli.

Mr. Gladstone was from that time the leader of the Liberal party. He and his rival, Disraeli, stand in marked contrast. Gladstone was devout and serious from his early youth; he had but little humour, and was intensely in earnest about everything, small and great. In early life Disraeli, on the other hand, posed as a fop and dandy; he wrote clever novels and satires, and was full of reckless and extravagant audacity. He began as a Radical and ended as a Conservative, while Gladstone was first a Tory, then a Peelite, and in the end almost if not quite a Radical. Disraeli's light banter and easy adjustment of his policy to changing conditions made him seem to Gladstone with his strong convictions an opportunist without conscience. In 1869 Gladstone for the first time became Prime Minister. By that time a thoroughgoing Liberal, he vigorously attacked domestic abuses, and especially urged ecclesiastical, educational, and legal reform.¹ But in 1874 an election brought Disraeli back into power, and his second ministry lasted until 1880. Unlike Gladstone, he was always interested in foreign and imperial rather than in merely home questions. He pleased the queen greatly in 1876 by securing for her from Parliament the title of Empress

¹ The details of these measures are discussed in the next chapter.

of India, and shortly after this he himself became Earl of Beaconsfield. He had every sign of royal favour, and his critics said that in return he promised to make the queen the arbitress of Europe, and that she should rule in England with authority like that of Elizabeth. For Gladstone, on the other hand, the queen had something like dread. He frightened her with his vehemence, overworked her with the volume of business which he submitted, and, as Beaconsfield said, treated the sovereign like a public department, while he himself humoured her as a woman. In 1878 Beaconsfield seemed immensely popular when he returned from the Congress of Berlin, having averted war with Russia and secured "peace with honour," but, notwithstanding this and the queen's favour, he was overwhelmingly defeated in the election of 1880, and he died in 1881. Lord Salisbury succeeded him as Conservative leader and found his chief task in resisting the insistent demands for change, especially in Ireland, passionately urged by Mr. Gladstone.



WILLIAM EWART GLADSTONE
(1809-1898).

Gladstone's second ministry, which lasted from 1880 to 1885, is chiefly remarkable for having brought about the final change through which political power was secured at last by the working classes. In 1884 was passed, not without resistance from the House of Lords, the third of the great Reform Bills, known usually as the Franchise Bill. This Act at last placed the voters in the counties on the same level as those in the towns; agricultural labourers and men in domestic service were given votes, and the electorate was increased from about three to about five mill-

The third
Reform Bill,
1884.

ions. It was the last link in the long process of development of the representative system in England, in which Henry II, who checked the barons, the barons, who checked Henry's son John, and the townsmen, who won recognition from Edward I, all play their part.

The election in 1885 under the new franchise had the singular result of making the Conservatives and the

The Home-Rule
problem.

members from Ireland, who demanded Home Rule, exactly equal in number to the Liberals. This at once forced to the front the Irish question. The Home-Rule problem, to which Gladstone devoted the later years of his life, is the most tangled and difficult that the British Parliament has ever been forced to deal with. Daniel O'Connell was the first to make heard the demand for repeal of the union of England and Ireland. He was a great orator; the Irish people hung upon his words; he could move them as he liked; but England would do nothing for repeal, and in 1847 O'Connell died heart-broken with failure. His death stimulated his friends to renewed effort, and in 1848, when all Europe was in revolt against existing governments, a few of the Irish took up arms, but with slight results, and John Mitchell, Smith O'Brien, and other leaders were transported. The greatest tragedy in

The Irish
Famine, 1846.

Irish history had helped to cause this rising. The population of Ireland, little more than two millions at the time of the American Revolution, had about quadrupled by 1846. It was not new industries that led, as in England, to such an increase; the bulk of Ireland's eight and a half millions tilled the soil and were dependent upon the potato, the most fruitful product to be secured from a small area of land. After partial failure in the autumn of the previous year, in 1846, almost in a night, a terrible blight fell upon the potato, and Ireland was left without food. The world's sympathy was aroused; the British Parliament spent money freely;

private charity was generous. But Ireland was wholly unaccustomed to draw food supplies from outside; there was no machinery for distributing it, great mismanagement and jobbery disfigured the early efforts, and before relief was effective thousands perished. Disease followed in the wake of famine; travellers passing through Ireland saw hundreds of bodies lying by the roadsides. There was a rush to escape from the doomed country, but the emigrant ships were so overcrowded and insanitary that in them disease was even more fatal than upon land. Within three years two millions left the country, and the movement has continued until at the present time the population of Ireland has declined to about one-half of what it was before 1846.

The famine left Ireland face to face with a new set of problems. Tragic as was the enforced exile of the people, it yet wrought the double good of giving them new homes and of relieving the pressure of population in the motherland. By the famine one-third of the landowners in Ireland were ruined. They could not pay their debts, and to relieve the situation Parliament passed in 1849 the Encumbered Estates Act, under which land tied up by entail and settlements could be sold for the benefit of creditors. But though land was thrown upon the market, it was bought, not by the Irish people, but by speculators, who took advantage of the low price and proved even harder than the old landlords. Ireland had still only the peace of exhaustion. The close of the American war in 1865 left many restless spirits of Irish birth without occupation, and they planned the Fenian movement. The result was a wild enterprise of revolt in Ireland and a futile invasion of Canada. Yet the Fenian agitation served the purpose of calling renewed attention to Ireland's grievances, and Mr. Gladstone attacked, in 1868, one flagrant cause of injustice, the Irish Established Church.

The results of
the famine.

Not more than one-fifth of the Irish people adhered to Protestantism, and of the Protestants only about one-half belonged to the Church of Ireland; yet it enjoyed great endowments and privileges. Though reforms had been made in 1833, the position of the Protestant Irish Church, supported largely by tithes paid by the Roman Catholic peasantry, with, moreover, their own Church to support, was still untenable. An election was fought on the issue; the Liberals won, and at last, in 1869, the Church of Ireland was wholly separated from the state, though it retained the Church buildings and the endowments secured since 1660, and the clergy enjoyed their vested interests during life. The other endowments were devoted to public purposes.

Mr. Gladstone followed the disestablishment of the Irish Church by a serious attempt to grapple with the land question, the real problem of Irish politics. In England the landowner built houses, made fences, drains, etc., and let this improved land to his tenants; but in Ireland the tenant got only land, and made his own improvements, which, when the lease expired, became the property of the landowner. Agriculture was the sole great industry, and every one must have a little land. Owing to the keen demand, tenants often agreed to pay far more than was possible, and when they defaulted they were at the mercy of the landlord. In Ulster alone was there a Tenant Right, by which the tenant could sell his improvements and lease to any one else of good character. Mr. Gladstone's Land Act of 1870 extended this right to the rest of Ireland, and provided that a tenant on leaving his holding should be paid for his improvements. This partial relief was followed by further demands, which matured into the Home-Rule movement, led by Isaac Butt, in 1871, but only effective when Charles Stewart Parnell, a very remarkable man, became leader a few years later. Parnell,

a Protestant gentleman of good family, had a passionate hatred for England, and his aim was wholly to destroy English influence in Ireland. He appealed to Irishmen in America and secured generous help; he organized the Home-Rule members of Parliament into a compact body under strict discipline, and was soon a formidable force. In 1879 Michael Davitt originated the National Land League. The land of Ireland, he said, belonged to the Irish people, and the League made a determined attack on the "rack rents," by which the landlord took from the tenant all that he could possibly pay, and landlords and tenants who opposed the League were terrorized under a system that came to be known as "boycotting."



CHARLES STEWART PARNELL
(1846-1891).

After 1880 the agitation in regard to the land in Ireland was so acute that, to afford relief, Mr. Gladstone passed the Land Act of 1881, which adopted the principle of a Land Court arbitrating between landlord and tenant, and with power to fix the rent. "The Three F's," Fixity of Tenure, Fair Rent, Free Sale of lease and improvements by the tenant, were now recognised, but the bill did not go far enough for Parnell. He agitated, went beyond the law, and, with John Dillon and others, was sent to Kilmainham jail, and the Government suppressed the Land League. But in 1882 Mr. Gladstone treated with Parnell, and turned finally to the policy of concession and conciliation, a change that caused Mr Forster, the Chief Secretary for Ireland, and Lord Cowper, the Viceroy, to resign. A week later, on May 6, 1882, Mr. Forster's successor, Lord Frederick Cavendish, and Mr. Burke, a high Irish official,

Mr. Gladstone
and Home Rule.

were murdered in Dublin, and the event aroused widespread horror and retarded the interests of Ireland. But the Reform Bill of 1832 gave a vote to the masses of the people in Ireland, and when, in the election of 1835, they sent to Parliament a solid phalanx of about seventy Home Rulers, who held the balance of power between the two great English parties, Mr. Gladstone surrendered wholly. In 1836 he introduced a Home-Rule Bill, intended to remove Irish members from the Imperial Parliament and to set up a Parliament at Dublin with restricted powers. A further bill provided that the Government should help tenants to buy their land. But Mr. Gladstone could not carry his bills. Mr. Joseph Chamberlain and others led an important section of the Liberal party, which took the name of "Liberal Unionists," into an alliance with the Conservatives, and drove the Liberal Home Rulers from power, and Lord Salisbury again became Prime Minister from 1836 to 1892. The agitation went on. "The Plan of Campaign" was a Home Rulers' league to resist payment of rent, and the Conservatives used coercion to put it down. But they, too, in 1887, passed a Land Act, reducing rent and giving tenants increased protection, and making easier the purchase of land. Further concessions followed, and the interest was keen when at last, in 1892, Mr. Gladstone again came into power, pledged to Home Rule. His bill of 1893, for setting up an Irish Parliament, passed the House of Commons, but, amidst great excitement, the Lords threw it out. Soon after Mr. Gladstone retired from public life, and he died in 1898. The Earl of Rosebery succeeded him as Prime Minister. The Liberals were profoundly divided; while the Prime Minister himself had no zeal for Home Rule, the Radical wing pressed not only for this concession to Ireland, but for sweeping domestic reforms.

In 1895 the Liberals were driven from office, and it seemed as if Gladstone, by his advocacy of Home Rule,

had wrecked the Liberal party without gaining the success for his cause which Peel secured when he broke up the Tory party on the question of the Corn Laws. But Lord Salisbury's government found that they must deal with the Irish question. In 1898 they extended to Ireland a great increase in local self-government, and at length, in 1903, the cabinet of Mr. Balfour, the successor of Lord Salisbury as Conservative leader, at last grappled with the land question, the real cause of discontent in Ireland. The aim of the Land Bill of 1903 is to transfer the land from the landlords to the actual occupiers of the soil. Government aid was necessary, for the tenants could not afford to pay what was considered the market value of the land, and it was finally arranged in effect that the state should lend the tenants money to enable them to buy out the landlords, that to help them to do this it should, in addition, make landowners a gift of some £12,000,000, and that the tenants should be allowed to repay the borrowed money in annual instalments somewhat less in amount than the rent which they had previously paid. The plan won the approval of all classes, and by this measure the Irish patriot at last saw within reach of attainment his dream, that the land of Ireland should belong to the people of Ireland. The fear that Home Rule would endanger the interests of the owners of the land was, perhaps, a chief cause of the defeat of Gladstone's bills. With the land in the possession of the people of Ireland this fear will be removed, and from the prolonged agitation of the Irish question a revived Irish Parliament may yet result.

The death of
Victoria, 1901.

The veteran queen did not live to see this measure. In January, 1901, Victoria died, after a remarkable reign of nearly sixty-four years. Perhaps no sovereign was ever before so widely respected or so universally mourned. When she died

Britain was deeply engaged in a struggle with the Boers, her first great war since that with Russia. For nearly a century the Dutch in South Africa had been trying to get rid of British supremacy. To do so they pushed into the far interior, founding there the South African Republic and the Orange Free State. In the former state gold was at length discovered in great quantities; outsiders flocked in, and when Britain began to demand that her own and other citizens should receive the franchise in the South African Republic on easy terms, the two Dutch states, afraid of foreign intruders, formed an alliance, armed themselves, and were well equipped for the war which at last broke out. But, as in the Crimean War, Britain was unprepared, while the struggle assumed unexpected proportions, and because it involved sending immense armaments by sea, proved the most costly of any of her wars, except that with Napoleon. She was able, however, slowly to wear down the opposing forces, and peace was finally concluded in 1902, on the basis of the annexation of the two former republics to the British Empire.

The great Boer War, 1899-1902.



EDWARD VII.

When the peace was made, Edward VII, Victoria's son, was king. He had already reached

the mature age of fifty-nine, and his long training in the difficult position of heir to the throne endowed him with special tact and discretion for his high office. His personal sympathies are understood to be with liberal measures, and the policy of conciliation in Ireland is said to owe some of its inspiration to him. It was immediately after Edward VII's corona-

Edward VII.

tion, in August, 1902, that Lord Salisbury, the last of the ten¹ prime ministers who had held office under Victoria, retired, and was succeeded by his nephew, Mr. A. J. Balfour. With a new sovereign and a new prime minister in power, the remarkable Victorian era may be said to have come to an end.

BOOKS FOR REFERENCE

Walpole, *History of England from the Conclusion of the Great War* (5 vols., 1886); * McCarthy, *The Four Georges and William IV* (4 vols., 1901); * McCarthy, *History of Our Own Times* (4 vols., 1886); * Morley, *Life of Cobden* (1885); Hodder, *Life of the Fourth Earl of Shaftesbury* (1892); Sanders, *Life of Viscount Palmerston* (1888); Froude, *Earl of Beaconsfield* (1890); * Russell, W. E. *Gladstone* (1896); Traill, *Marquis of Salisbury* (1892) (the last three in the series, *The Queen's Prime Ministers*); * Lee, *Life of Queen Victoria* (1902); Bryce, *Studies in Contemporary Biography*.

¹ Lord Melbourne, 1835-1841; Sir Robert Peel, 1841-1846; Lord John (Earl) Russell, 1846-1852; 1865-1866; the Earl of Derby, 1852; 1858-1859; 1867-1868; the Earl of Aberdeen, 1852-1855; Lord Palmerston, 1855-1858; 1859-1865; Benjamin Disraeli (Earl of Beaconsfield), 1868; 1874-1880; W. E. Gladstone, 1869-1874; 1880-1885; 1886; 1892-1894; The Marquis of Salisbury, 1885-1886; 1886-1892; 1895-1902; the Earl of Rosebery, 1894-1895.

CHAPTER XXII


Social Changes in the Nineteenth Century

THE steamship, the railway-train, the electric telegraph, the newspaper, and cheap postage (all occupied with facilitating travel or the interchange of commodities and ideas) have influenced modern life probably more than any other agencies. The steamboat Clermont was plying in America on the Hudson in 1807, but not until 1812, when Henry Bell launched the Comet on the Clyde, did Britain's course in steam navigation begin, and it was only in 1838 that a ship crossed the Atlantic by steam-power alone, a feat that had been declared impossible. In 1814 George Stephenson constructed an engine, nicknamed Puffing Billy, from its noise, and showed that the steam locomotive was possible; by 1825 the Stockton and Darlington Railway was carrying both passengers and goods, and the Liverpool and Manchester Railway opened in 1830. Stephenson boasted that it should be cheaper for a workman to ride in a coach than to wear out energy and shoe-leather in walking, and he kept his word; it was not long before a network of railways made travel easy. Henceforth bulky articles were readily carried both by land and sea; commerce expanded, and Britain became more than ever the workshop of the world.

Until the reign of William IV London alone had daily newspapers. The Government imposed a tax of fourpence on each sheet of a newspaper, and three shillings and sixpence on each advertisement. In return, news-

papers received a Government stamp, insuring free carriage in the post; but the cost to subscribers of a daily newspaper so heavily taxed was about £10 a year. The tax was reduced in 1836 to a penny a sheet, and eightpence on advertisements, and from that time the newspaper grew steadily cheaper. In 1855, when the public was eager to get news of the war in the Crimea, the special

The improvement and cheapening of newspapers.



THE FIRST RAILWAY COACH.

Before the success of the steam locomotive was assured, a coach drawn by a horse was used on the line between Stockton and Darlington.

tax was wholly abolished. Before long London had penny newspapers, and now the halfpenny paper is common. The newspaper, while it grew cheaper, increased also in efficiency as a record of the world's doings. In 1814 *The Times* was first printed by steam-power, and henceforth newspapers could be produced much more promptly and rapidly. There was still great need of improvement in the quality of the news. That from abroad long came in sailing vessels, that at home by post or special courier, and it was a great feat when couriers covered the distance from Glasgow to London in little more than twenty-four hours. But the tele-

graph changed all this. The first public telegraph was set up in England in 1844; by 1850 the invention was in general use, and upon it the newspapers soon began to rely for news. In 1866, when a cable was at last laid from Britain to America, the chief political and commercial centres were brought into immediate touch with each other, and now daily news of the occurrences in all parts of the world has become almost a necessity.

A strenuous campaign for penny postage was begun in 1837 by Rowland Hill. The existing practice was to charge for postage in proportion to the distance covered. To send a letter from one part of London to another cost a penny; to send one from London to Edinburgh cost more than a shilling. Daniel O'Connell complained that an Irish labourer in England, writing to and hearing from his family weekly, would spend more than one-fifth of his wages in postage. Payment was usually made on delivery, and Rowland Hill has told us how his mother sometimes dreaded the arrival of a letter, lest she should not have the money to pay for it. It frequently happened that the poor, to get intelligence of each other's welfare, would agree to send only an addressed sheet of paper; this the receiver would refuse to accept from the postman, who would carry it off, but its coming would show that the sender was well. While the poor felt the heavy burden of postage, peers, members of the House of Commons, and high officials had the "franking" privilege, by which their own and their friends' letters addressed by the holders of the privilege were carried free of charge. Large areas of England were wholly without a postal service. Cobden had his print-works in Sabden, a town with 12,000 inhabitants, but without a post-office. And the existing inadequate system was cumbrous and expensive. Elaborate accounts were kept with each postmaster for the unpaid letters sent to him, and upon routine, rather than upon the carriage of letters, the revenue was

spent. Hill proved, indeed, that the average cost of carrying letters was much less than a penny for each, and he urged that it was fair to make a uniform charge for all letters. But the official world arrayed itself against him. The authorities would not allow Hill into the London Post-Office to examine its workings, and they declared that the postal service could never deal with the immense mass of correspondence which cheap postage would invite. But the business world supported the proposal, and in 1839 Lord Melbourne's government established the penny post. As Mr. Gladstone said, the improvement "ran like wildfire through the civilized world," and it has become one of the most important factors in modern civilization.

The rapid increase of population in London made the problem of police urgent, and in 1829 Sir Robert Peel passed through Parliament an act creating a metropolitan police force, and founding police in the modern sense. The slang terms "Bobbies" and "Peelers" for policemen are taken from the name of the author of the bill. What we now know as police work had hitherto been divided among a variety of officers—watchmen, thief-takers, street-keepers, etc., usually few, ill-paid, and inefficient. Peel's aim was not so much to punish as to prevent crime, and the test of merit in the police force was to be its absence rather than its mere detection. By June, 1830, the London force consisted of 3,314 persons, and a police system for the whole nation, remarkable for its efficiency, was soon evolved. But in the first stages there was great opposition. Cobbett denounced Peel as attempting to introduce Bourbon militarism into England, and "Peel's Bloody Gang" came in for much abuse. Hand in hand with the prevention of crime went the milder punishment of criminals. Sir Samuel Romilly worked long to soften the savagery of the criminal law. Yet when he died, in 1818, little had been done, for as the old type of judge

Peel's police
and improve-
ments in the
administration
of justice.

was potent especially in the House of Lords, and many feared that mildness would promote lawlessness, the Lords long threw out all bills mitigating the penalties of crime. But by 1837 the death penalty for forgery, coining, horse or sheep stealing, and similar offences was abolished, and soon after the judges sentenced to death for murder only. Transportation was abolished in 1853, and the gruesome public executions in 1868. Howard's agitation regarding prisons also bore slow fruit. The Society for the Improvement of Prison Discipline continued Howard's work. In Millbank Penitentiary, opened in 1816, each prisoner was for the first time provided with a separate cell, but not until 1835 was Pentonville, the second "model" penitentiary, begun. Progress was slow, but the change has in time proved complete. The old prison pest-houses have disappeared; the law now requires that every male prisoner shall have a separate cell, much attention is paid to moral improvement, labour is compulsory, and by good conduct the prisoner can earn a remission of about one-quarter of his sentence. The mingled kindness and severity of the system have justified themselves; when Victoria began to reign, England had about 50,000 convicts; when she died there were less than 6,000. Not only in regard to the treatment of criminals did the law change. Until 1873 the higher courts of justice still proceeded on lines laid down five centuries earlier, but in that year was passed "the Judicature Act," combining and reorganizing the elements of the old legal system and removing many abuses which had grown up.

Church questions have always occupied a large place in British social life. The Evangelical movement, with leaders like Wilberforce, John Venn, rector of Clapham, and Hannah More, whose writings carried its teaching everywhere, revived the old Puritan strictness. In founding the Church Missionary Society they showed great missionary zeal, and they

Religious
questions.

disparaged the exclusive claims of episcopacy. But in 1833, the year of the greatest evangelical triumph—the abolition of slavery—a movement began at Oxford which laid great emphasis upon the orders of bishops, priests, and deacons in the Church of England as descending in direct succession from apostolic times. It showed a dislike for Protestantism and its break with tradition at the Reformation, and, while rejecting the supremacy of the Pope, approached very closely to the Roman Church in many points of ritual and doctrine. The chief leaders—Newman, Keble, and Pusey—wrote tracts and carried on an active propaganda. In 1841 Newman issued Tract 90, in which he tried to reconcile the Thirty-nine Articles of the Church of England with the decrees of the Council of Trent. The “Tractarians” found Oxford against them. A few years later Newman joined the Church of Rome, to become ultimately a cardinal, and not long after Archdeacon Manning (who also became a cardinal), Archdeacon Wilberforce, and other prominent Anglicans, took the same course and aroused great alarm among Protestants. But Pusey and Keble clung to the Church of England, and in the end attained very wide influence. Tractarianism would have revived the stricter discipline of the mediæval Church and increased the power of the clergy. In this it ran counter to the spirit of the time. The formalism of the Tractarians and their devotion to the externals of religion led Dr. Arnold, the famous head-master of Rugby, to denounce them as idolaters. The Broad Church party attacked ecclesiastical narrowness, and assailed especially the barriers which, by



JOHN HENRY NEWMAN,
CARDINAL (1801-1890).

requiring undergraduates to sign the Thirty-nine Articles, made Oxford and Cambridge Church of England preserves. In 1854, after searching inquiry by a Royal Commission, these tests were at last removed. It had long been apparent that reform in the distribution of the Church's revenues was necessary. The Bishop of Durham had £19,000 a year, but others of the bishops only £2,000 or £3,000; populous new parishes with many hard-worked clergy were without endowment, while some of the cathedral foundations had many highly paid officials with few duties. The year 1836 saw the establishment by Parliament of a body of Ecclesiastical Commissioners, who have since used their great powers in removing some of these abuses. The failure of the Tractarians to make their view of the Church's authority felt by the masses of the nation appeared in 1837, when, in spite of their protests, divorce was removed entirely from the control of the Church, and, for the first time in Britain, power was given to a secular tribunal to dissolve the marriage tie. Secular courts further showed their authority over the Church by condemning the ritual innovations of Dr. Pusey's followers; and in 1880 the Church's exclusive right to the burial-grounds, long controlled by her, was taken away; they were made national property by an act permitting any one to conduct "a Christian and orderly religious service" therein.

The drift of the times was thus towards reform within the Church of England and towards removing from her members any exclusive privileges. Each of the three kingdoms had its established Church, that of Scotland being Presbyterian, and the whole scheme of Church establishments was assailed. In 1843, when the civil courts asserted the right of a lay patron to appoint a minister of the Church of Scotland to a parish in defiance of the wishes of the parishioners, Dr. Chalmers, a leading Scottish divine, led more than one-third of the ministers and about one-half

The secession
from the Church
of Scotland.

of the people in secession from the Established Church and formed the Free Church of Scotland. The division continues, but the old Church is still established by law; and though Mr. Gladstone, as we have seen, overthrew the establishment in Ireland, all assaults upon the English and Scottish establishments have failed.

Except in regard to Home Rule for Ireland, no measure in the last half of the nineteenth century aroused such keen hopes and passions in the masses as the Reform Bill and the repeal of the Corn Laws in the earlier period. Time has brought something like exhaustion and reaction, and the average voter of to-day has probably less faith in the efficacy of legislative change than had the enthusiasts of fifty years ago. But no government has attempted to undo a reforming measure once passed, and during the last half of the century a complex series of enactments worked steadily towards the goal of removing class privileges and restraints upon personal liberty, of advancing education, and of promoting efficiency and purity in the different branches of the public service. The crowning privilege of the freeman to choose those who shall govern the state has been guarded with increased care. In 1854 and 1883 acts were passed dealing with corrupt practices at elections, and imposing heavy penalties on the voter who sold his vote and the candidate for Parliament or his agents who bought it. By an act of 1858 one of the aims of the Chartists was realized when property qualification was no longer required from members of Parliament; to vote or to sit in Parliament ceased to be a carefully guarded privilege, and perhaps this is one cause of the decline in respect for that assembly observable in modern Britain. Though Parliament is a tribunal peculiarly liable to be swayed by party passions, it settled disputes in regard to elections until an act of 1868 removed election petitions to the courts of justice

Electoral, civil
service, and
other reforms.

for trial. The Catholic Emancipation Bill of 1829 admitted Roman Catholics to Parliament, but not until 1858 were Jews admitted; and when, in 1886, after prolonged controversy, Charles Bradlaugh, an avowed atheist, was allowed to take his seat, the cycle of toleration was complete. Only in 1868 was removed the privilege of members of the House of Lords to record their votes by proxy, and thus to influence the decisions of Parliament without taking part in its proceedings. After a long agitation, the Ballot Bill, establishing the principle of voting by ballot, was passed in 1872, and the danger of intimidation involved in open voting was removed. In 1877, with the avowed end of making the House of Commons ineffective, the Irish Home-Rule members began a system of obstructive tactics; for four or five years they reduced it at times to great disorder, and these methods were only checked when, in 1882 and 1887, closure rules, for summarily ending prolonged debates, were adopted. Parliament had meanwhile grown used to scenes far removed from the stilted decorum of full-dress debate in Pitt's time. Something of dignity has indeed been lost, but by the frankness of modern discussion the efficiency of the public service has been greatly improved. Class privilege has also steadily declined. The civil service and the army had been guarded in the interests of the favoured few, until, in 1871, Mr. Gladstone's government threw open the majority of appointments to those who could pass a competitive examination; in the same year he cancelled the evil purchase system by which advance in the army depended not upon competence, but upon the power to buy promotion.

Increased attention to the study of nature marks the modern period; during it the natural sciences took on a wholly new aspect. In 1859 Darwin published his remarkable work *The Origin of Species*, which asserted the principle that, by a law of evolution, the forms of life on the

earth constantly change to adjust themselves to changing conditions, and that the two cardinal principles under which this takes place are the struggle for existence and the consequent survival of the fittest; in other words, that in nature life tends to multiply more rapidly than food, and that a conflict for the means to live ensues, in which the strongest succeed. Nature thus always preserves those best fitted to survive. In time Darwin's theory was seen to affect men's outlook in almost every department of thought. Since the foundation of the Geological Society in 1807, geology had made steady advances; the doctrine of evolution gave it a new interest, as aiding the study of the successive forms of life in remote ages. Its economic importance, especially as associated with mineralogy, the study of nature's supply of minerals, also became more evident; and systematic geological surveys of Britain, India, Canada, etc., have marked the period. The same spirit has been carried into chemistry, practically a new science, which has now become of immense import both in agriculture and in manufactures.

The systematic observation and study required by modern science have produced beneficent results in regard to public health. Since the middle of the century, sanitation has received great attention from the municipal authorities. No longer are the poor permitted to live in the state of filth formerly almost universal; and good drainage, public baths, a proper water-supply, have united to give the pure air and the cleanliness which prevent scourges like cholera, formerly so disastrous in Britain. At the beginning of the century the majority of those who practised medicine had passed no qualifying examination and were subject to no authoritative control, and not until 1886 did the law require adequate tests in every branch of the profession. Modern discoveries have greatly lessened the suf-

The growth
of scientific
knowledge.

Scientific
training for the
professions.

fering caused by the surgeon's knife. In 1844 a Massachusetts dentist began to use nitrous oxide; ether was already known, and in 1847 Sir James Y. Simpson, of Edinburgh, discovered chloroform; to the power derived from these anæsthetics to make the patient insensible to pain without injury the highly skilled surgery of modern times is largely due. Lord Lister's application of antiseptics in surgery has, by preventing contagion, immensely reduced the death-rate from disease. War has been rendered more merciful by the improved care of the sick and wounded. The two professions of the army and navy have also become scientific. Quick-firing guns, artillery with a range of many miles, the use of electric signals effective at a great distance, have all profoundly changed the art of attack and of defence, but have made the defence relatively the stronger. Steam-power has emphasized Britain's advantage as mistress of the seas, for she can now make her superior naval force effective with little regard to wind or weather. In 1855 she began to cover the old wooden war-ships with plate-armour; now war-ships are wholly of steel, and the control of their complex mechanism involves a high degree of scientific knowledge. In manufactures the same technical skill is now required. Many say, indeed, that Britain has not adequately realized this, and that scientific methods and knowledge in the United States and in Germany are far in advance of hers.

While England has been slow to improve effectively her methods of education, Scotland by the end of the fifteenth century already had a national system that involved the two points of putting the means of education within the reach of all and of compelling the people to make use of them. No advance upon these principles was possible, and in Scotland modern times have only seen their better application. England has had greater difficulties. Before the

Advances in
education.

Reform Bill of 1832 Parliament could not be persuaded to make a grant to public education; but it is to the credit of the first Reformed Parliament that one of its earliest acts was to vote £20,000 for this purpose. Democracy to be successful must be intelligent. In 1867, by the second Reform Bill, more than two million new voters were enfranchised, and Mr. Robert Lowe said, "We must now at least educate our new masters." These new masters have themselves proved eager for enlightenment. The small sum voted for education in 1833 has grown until it is now about £13,000,000 yearly. In 1870, under Mr. W. E. Forster's Elementary Education Bill, an adequate supply of schools was provided and the attendance of children was enforced. Fear of a merely secular system, divorcing education and religion, has prevented the growth in England of a unified scheme completely under state direction. The Church of England, and in a lesser degree the Roman Catholics and other bodies, still conduct a large number of voluntary schools which receive state aid. The education bill of 1902 greatly increased this aid, but at the same time provided for more effective inspection, and gave control to the laity rather than to the clergy; the two systems—the one controlled by the state, the other by the different church authorities—divide between them elementary education, and the education problem is still the subject of keen controversy; under neither system does the law permit religious teaching to be compulsory. For secondary education Britain has many noble foundations; and ancient public schools like Eton, Winchester, and Westminster have been supplemented in modern times by such new schools as Cheltenham, Clifton, and Marlborough. The Royal Commission which began in 1852 to inquire into the condition of the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge, soon described the governing body at Oxford as "an organized torpor." Many abuses were attacked and abolished, but not until 1882 were the

reforms in the two universities completed. At the present time both Oxford and Cambridge are free to all comers, and their influence has increased enormously in consequence. But they no longer have a monopoly of higher education in England; London, Durham, Manchester, Birmingham, Liverpool, Wales have universities. Scotland still has her four ancient foundations of St. Andrews, Glasgow, Aberdeen, and Edinburgh; and Ireland, where the course of education has followed that of England rather than of Scotland, has the new Royal University in addition to the ancient University of Dublin (Trinity College).

In artistic spirit the British are still behind their neighbours the French. Turner and Constable are, however, great names in the roll of painters of the nineteenth century, and the remarkable work of a group of men—Millais, Rossetti, Holman Hunt, and others—who strove to shake off the conventions observed by followers of the great masters and called themselves the Pre-Raphaelite Brotherhood, has attracted much attention. The trenchant criticism of Mr. Ruskin also aided an artistic revival. In architecture the modern period has seen a departure from the classic style of the eighteenth century, and a renewed attention to the Gothic style, that has worked in sympathy with the Tractarian movement in religious thought. In literature there is a long roll of great names. Scott, the most fascinating of British writers of romance, had as contemporaries, early in the century, the poets Byron, Shelley, and Keats—all of whom died young, but not before they had struck, in an age of revolution, a new and often defiant note of poetic thought. Wordsworth's insight into the meaning of nature, while like theirs in spirit, found much calmer expression. The poetical work of Coleridge, Tennyson, Browning, and Matthew Arnold, and of a host of minor writers, proved that a century of material progress might

Art and literature in Britain.

be also one of poetic inspiration. In other walks of literature there are conspicuous names. As an historian Macaulay ranks probably lower than Gibbon, the great name of the eighteenth century, but in his time he commanded wider attention. Thomas Carlyle, though he too wrote history, gained influence rather as a great moral teacher. Dickens and Thackeray still stand supreme as Scott's successors in the realm of fiction.

Increased intelligence on the part of the individual is the condition of success in modern life, and this enlightenment has added enormously to comfort and convenience. So small a thing as the friction match, unknown until the nineteenth century, has proved an immense boon. The cottage of the mediæval labourer had rarely even candlelight; now petroleum and gaslight are in universal use, and even in small villages electric light is found. Few houses are so poor as to be without a picture on the wall or a carpet on the floor, and tea, coffee, and tobacco, once luxuries, are now in use by all classes. Most towns and villages have some kind of free library which makes good reading accessible to all. This improved intelligence has justified itself: the fanatic violence that threatened to destroy London during the madness of the Gordon Riots is now scarcely possible. Friendly societies unite the poor in bonds mutually helpful. The laws which prevented the free organization of the working classes in trade unions have all been swept away, and capital and labour are alike free to protect themselves by all peaceful means. The status of women, an unfailing test of the progress of society, is now so high that she is found in some of the learned professions, and plays an important part in the great world of business. Manners have steadily softened. To seek to kill your foe in a duel was, as late as in 1840, still demanded by the code of honour, but in 1844 the War Office imposed heavy

The improve-
ment of social
conditions, and
softening of
manners.

penalties upon duelling officers; in the next year Roebuck, by bringing the matter up in the House of Commons, forced a fellow member of Parliament, who had challenged him, to apologize, and the duel disappeared from English life. In the middle of the century the decline of prize-fighting was regarded by so good a man as George Borrow as a mark of the decay of national vigour; now men of his class look upon the sport as merely brutal. Fifty years ago, to get drunk caused hardly a reproach; now it is the certain brand of failure in business, in public and in social life. Hatred is a declining factor in politics, and statesmen, passing each other in the street, no longer call out opprobrious names as they sometimes did less than a century ago. Then, too, classes were divided by a great gulf, and noblemen were almost a race apart. In Britain the distinctions of rank are still marked, but the great are now less insolent, the poor less bitter, and rank is a freer reward to successful effort than ever it was before; high posts in the army are no longer closed to the common soldier, who sometimes becomes a general. Public opinion now insists that those who have power have also responsibility, and a higher sense of duty is observable among the ruling classes; in the present age landlords would not venture to house their tenants as many of them were housed fifty years ago. In the royal navy, at the beginning of the modern period, sailors were flogged for trifling offences, they lived in dark and unsanitary quarters, and were allowed so much rum as to encourage drunkenness; in the army soldiers slept two in a narrow bed, the provisions for the wives who sometimes accompanied their husbands showed little regard for decency, and the food was usually bad. Now, in both services comfortable quarters and good food are the rule. Yet recent wars have shown that the easier conditions of modern times have not undermined courage or the capacity to bear necessary hardships.

Present conditions of life are in some respects unwholesome. The need of capital in agriculture has worked against those of small means and wholly destroyed the class of sturdy villagers, who, though poor, had a proprietary interest in the soil and tilled it with their own hands; now hired labourers do this work, and so universal is the system that we are apt to forget its recent and regrettable growth, and that a hundred years ago the labourer had often a partner's share in the products of the farm. Village life has lost some of its old attractions, and the people now flock into the great centres of population, which have grown enormously; in 1901 more than twenty-five of the thirty-two and a half millions in England and Wales were dwellers in towns. But the dense and smoky air and crowded quarters make British cities less wholesome than are the villages, and a present-day problem is how to bring the people back to the land. One of the chief difficulties is that the easy transportation of food products has drawn to Britain supplies from all parts of the world, and so lowered prices that agriculture no longer attracts capital by the profits to be earned. British energy is devoted ever more and more to manufacturing industry, and less and less does Britain herself produce the food for her own people. To some this seems a serious danger, but so long as she can by her naval power command sea communications, and in consequence supplies, her position is secure.

SUMMARY OF DATES

Social unrest marked the end of George III's reign. The **Six Acts** imposing arbitrary restrictions upon the circulation of free opinion were passed in 1819, but when George IV's reign began, in 1820, the demand for thoroughgoing reform was already urgent. The oppressive **Test and Corporation Acts** of Charles II's reign were repealed in 1828. The **Catholic Relief Bill** was passed in 1829. The **first Reform Bill** was passed in 1832. The Reformed Parliament abolished slavery in 1833, regulated child labour in factories

in the same year, and passed the important Poor Law Amendment Act in 1834. The Tractarian movement in the Church of England began in 1833. A new postage scheme involving the penny post was adopted in 1839. The secession in the Scottish Church took place in 1843. The agitation for free trade, led by Cobden, became active in 1839, and in 1846 Sir Robert Peel carried a bill for the gradual Repeal of the Corn Laws. The terrible Irish Famine was in 1846, and was followed by an Irish insurrection. The Great Exhibition took place in 1851. In December, 1853, the British fleet entered the Black Sea and made war with Russia certain; the Crimean War began in 1854, and Sebastopol fell on September 8, 1855. Peace was made at Paris in March, 1856. The Indian Mutiny broke out in 1857, and ended in 1858. The right of Jews to sit in Parliament was conceded in 1858. The Prince Consort died in December, 1861. The second of the great Reform Bills became law in 1867. The Irish Church was disestablished in 1869. The Elementary Education Act was passed in 1870. The Ballot Bill, introducing voting by ballot, became law in 1872. The Supreme Court of Judicature Act, remodelling the courts of justice, was passed in 1873. The Treaty of Berlin, which averted war with Russia, was made in 1878, and Britain occupied Cyprus in return for guaranteeing Turkey's Asiatic dominions. The Land League was begun in 1879, and the Home Rule agitation, led by Parnell, soon became acute. The third Reform Bill, widely extending the franchise, became law in 1884. General Gordon was killed at Khartoum in 1885. Mr. Gladstone adopted the policy of Home Rule for Ireland in 1886, and the Liberal Unionists, led by the Duke of Devonshire and Mr. Chamberlain, withdrew from the Liberal party. Mr. Gladstone's first Home Rule Bill was defeated in 1886. Britain in 1890 reached an agreement with other European powers as to spheres of influence in Africa. Mr. Gladstone's second Home Rule Bill was defeated in 1893. General Kitchener took Khartoum in 1898, and confirmed Britain's hold upon Egypt. The war with the Boer Republics broke out in 1899, and ended with their conquest in 1902. Victoria died in 1901. A new Education Bill in 1902 increased aid to voluntary schools, and aimed to improve the standard by better inspection. The Irish Land Bill of 1903 provided for the transfer of the land to the occupiers.

BOOKS FOR REFERENCE

See the works mentioned in Traill, *Social England*, vol. vi. The topics covered are very numerous, and the books dealing with them difficult to classify.

CHAPTER XXIII

The Growth of the British Dominions

THE history of the United Kingdom does not exhaust the history of the British Nation, which has colonized or conquered until the mother isles represent but a small fraction of the vast whole of British territory. The British Dominions may be divided into three classes :

The different
classes of Brit-
ish territory.

1. Territories occupied by alien peoples now ruled by Britain. India, with its old civilization, is the chief possession of this kind. The extensive British possessions in both East and West Africa are of the same nature, but there the native races are less advanced.

2. Territories now containing but few of the native races, and settled, or in course of settlement, by the British race. These include three vast areas in three separate continents—Canada in America, Australia and New Zealand in Oceania, and the British dominions in South Africa. The West Indian islands take a minor place in the same category, though in some of them the African negro predominates.

3. Stations (chiefly islands) held by Britain for strategic purposes, to furnish supply posts for her navy, etc. (such as Gibraltar, Malta, Bermuda, St. Helena, and numerous islands in the South Sea and near the coast of South America).

The real key to British expansion has been the strength, courage, and adventurous spirit of a race not content to remain bound by the limits of its island home.

Its sons ventured forth, engaged in trade, and where their interests demanded it fought their rivals; they sometimes assumed political authority, and usually they did it all at their own cost and risk. Of the self-governing portions of the empire beyond the limit of the United Kingdom, Canada, with nearly six million inhabitants, is the most important, both in numbers and in the incidents accompanying its history. New France in North America for a long time struggled to overthrow New England. It was French, not English, pioneers who were the first Europeans to see the great lakes, rivers, and mountains of the American interior. But France showed slight genius for colonization; few of her people emigrated to the New World, and the home Government interfered constantly and unwisely in the affairs of the colony. With such drawbacks it is little short of amazing that the few thousand French in Canada should have been able long to carry on an aggressive warfare against neighbours twenty-fold more numerous; but the struggle could not last, and in 1763, as a result of the victories in which Wolfe's name is most conspicuous, New France was ceded to Britain. By a singular fate, Britain's present empire in North America is that which France founded; her own American colonies broke away from the motherland.

The lines upon which the relations of the great colonies to the mother country should be determined were laid in Canada. It did not join the American provinces in the revolt against Britain, but, on the contrary, in 1775 repelled the invasion of the Americans. A little later hundreds of Loyalists left the United States to settle in the territory that had remained British. This territory was divided into a variety of separate colonies and governments—Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Lower Canada, Upper Canada, etc.; and before the end of the eighteenth cen-

The acquisition
of Canada,
1763.

The growth of
constitutional
liberty in
Canada.

ture there was an elective legislature in each province. But in no case had the legislature control of the government; in Lower Canada the French were ruled by an English minority, while in Upper Canada radical reformers found their plans balked by an executive that paid little heed to the elected legislators. At length, in the year that Victoria came to the throne, Canada saw serious rebellion, and the Whig Government in Britain, aroused by a critical situation, sent out Lord Durham with large powers to inquire into the cause of the trouble and suggest a remedy. Lord Durham was in Canada only a few months when a turn of the party warfare at home led to his recall; but he prepared a masterly report, which is perhaps the most important document in British colonial history. He found, as he said, "two peoples warring in the bosom of a single state," the French jealous of the English and holding aloof from intercourse, while the English themselves chafed under the restrictions upon their own self-government. To remove discontent and to effect his avowed end that the British element should become supreme over the French, Lord Durham advocated full constitutional liberty for British North America and union among all the provinces. The time was not yet ripe for the complete union which he desired, but in 1841 an Act of Parliament united Upper and Lower Canada into one state, and provided for government on the lines of that in England. Though for a few years still the governors seemed to think themselves responsible



JOHN GEORGE LAMBTON,
EARL OF DURHAM (1792-1840).

to a British colonial minister rather than to the Canadian Parliament, before 1850 Canada had won for herself and, as it proved, for all the greater British colonies, the complete self-government that makes them practically independent states. Events in Canada were thus really of world-wide import.

Canada did not yet include Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, and other colonies, but still had only the French province, now Quebec, and the English one, now Ontario. Both French and English demanded that the ministry of the day should be acceptable to them, and the unwritten law was observed that a ministry must have not only an absolute majority in the House, but a majority of the representatives from each of the provinces; and each party had both a French and an English leader. Twenty years' experience showed this cumbrous system to be unworkable. Owing to jealousies of race and creed, no ministry could stay long in office, and at last, in 1865, an active movement began to include all the provinces of British North America in a new Canadian Union. In 1867, by a statute of the British Parliament known as the British North America Act, the Dominion of Canada came into existence; and by 1872 it included the whole of British North America except Newfoundland, and stretched from the Atlantic to the Pacific.

The Canadian confederation was formed just after the great civil war in the United States, and Sir John Macdonald, the Canadian statesman chiefly responsible for the union, tried to avoid dangers in the federal system which the war had revealed. He aimed especially to give wide powers to the federal government and strictly to define the jurisdiction of the several provinces, which possess only the limited powers delegated to them. To unite the Atlantic and the Pacific portions of Canada a transcontinental railway was

The formation of
the Dominion of
Canada, 1867.

The Canadian
type of federal
government.

required, and the Canadian Pacific Railway was completed in 1885. It now controls more than ten thousand miles of railway, and is a stupendous corporation; and so rapid has been Canadian development that two other similar lines are now being constructed. Nearly a hundred years of peace—there has been no war since that with the United States, which closed in 1815—have enabled Canada to begin in earnest the use of her own resources. One of Nature's compensations for her northern latitude is that the severe frosts of winter retain in the soil soluble nitrates which are drained off in milder climates, but which improve greatly the quality of wheat; the Canadian Northwest has already become a great wheat-producing area, with vast undeveloped possibilities. Canada's main interest is still agricultural, but she has also great mineral wealth, and the iron and other industries are growing rapidly.



SIR JOHN ALEXANDER
MACDONALD (1815-1891).

The great continent Australia lay for untold ages remote and almost untenanted until British energy added it to the number of civilized states. While rocks now high in the Alps were still under water it was already dry land; but the ancient world knew nothing of it, and its few degraded aborigines never passed out of the savage state. The Spanish and Portuguese who crossed the Pacific in the sixteenth century appear to have missed it because it lay so far in the Southern Sea, but Torres, a Spaniard, probably came in sight of it in 1605, and in 1642 the enterprising Dutch in the East Indies sent Tasman to look for

The founding
of Australia.

the long-talked-of continent. He reached both Tasmania and New Zealand. But no colonization of this "New Holland" followed. In 1689 Dampier, a half-piratical sea-rover, was the first known Englishman to put foot in Australia; eighty years later Captain Cook raised there the British flag, named "Botany Bay" from its interesting plants, and called the land New South Wales. Still there was no colonization, and until the American Revolution Australia was a derelict continent. For a long time a considerable part of the convict population of Britain had been sent to work on the American planta-



CAPTAIN JAMES COOK
(1728-1779).


tions. With the Revolution this of course stopped, and then the British Government found itself burdened each year with some five hundred convicted persons, whom formerly it had got rid of without expense, since contractors in America had been ready to pay from £8 to £10 each for these unfortunates, and to clothe and feed them for their labour. The problem of a new outlet was carefully considered, and at length

Britain decided to found a convict colony in Australia. Only then did Australian history really begin. In January, 1788, two British men-of-war, six transports, and three store-ships sailed into Botany Bay; of the 1,100 on board, 750 were convicts. A few days later two French ships arrived off the coast. They may have had some intention of raising the French flag, and the saying that Britain won Australia by six days has this basis of truth.

Phillip, the leader of the British expedition, decided to make his settlement not at Botany Bay, but at the

adjacent Port Jackson, and within a few weeks the site where Sydney now stands was a scene of busy life. The colony grew only slowly. Convicts are not good colonists, and there was much disorder. But the land proved fairly fertile; coal was discovered in 1797, and wool-growing, Australia's great industry, began on a large scale in 1805. The natives, few and feeble, gave little trouble, and while the mother country was occupied with the long Napoleonic struggle her

The growth
of settlement.



MAP OF AUSTRALIA.

sons were building a new nation in the Southern Sea. In Tasmania colonization began in 1804, but Melbourne, the nucleus of the colony of Victoria, and now a city with half a million inhabitants, was not founded until 1837; while Queensland in the north, with Brisbane as its capital, had not an organized government until 1840. Tasmania, Vic-

toria, and Queensland were all daughters of New South Wales, and long subject to the final authority of the government at Sydney. But the extensive and not very attractive stretches of the western coast were not within the bounds of New South Wales, and only the fear that the French might establish a post on that coast caused permanent settlement to begin there in 1826; the definite establishment of the colony followed in 1829. The great intervening and, in some places, very fertile area between Western Australia and New South Wales and the other colonies on the east coast was formed in 1834 into the huge province of South Australia. This, with the exception of the great and chiefly desert stretch of country known as the Northern Territory, for the time administered by South Australia, completed the division into six colonies of the whole island continent. By 1859 the colonies were all entirely independent of each other, and, sharing in the results of the victory for autonomy in Canada, they too had almost complete self-government.

The coast line of Australia is singularly unbroken, and a cordon of high land lies between it and the great basin of the interior, which has extensive wastes of arid sand. The mountains are in no case so high as to be permanently snow-capped, and as there appear to be few water springs, the rivers are immediately dependent for their volume upon the changing rainfall. In consequence the Darling is, in wet seasons, a huge stream, with more than 7,000 miles of navigable water, but it shrinks in dry weather to small proportions. No great navigable rivers open up the interior of Australia as the St. Lawrence and Mississippi open that of America. For years the colonists of Sydney were unable to get to the interior past the precipices of the Blue Mountains, which shut them in to a narrow strip of coast; but by 1815 an adventurous explorer had discovered a means of access, and rich grazing lands were then made available. In

The progress
of Australia.

Australia about thirteen thousand miles of railway have already been built, but there is still no railway across the continent, and vast tracts of the interior are almost unexplored. Soon after the great inrush of gold-seekers into California in 1849 gold was discovered in Australia also, and the colony of Victoria in particular had a rapid growth of population. The climate has proved favourable to Europeans. Except in the mountainous districts, frost and snow are unknown, and, owing to the dry air, the heat, though great, is endurable. Emigration from Britain to Australia has now almost ceased, and the country depends upon the rather slow natural increase of population. Ninety-five per cent of the inhabitants of European origin are of British descent, and already, though the foundations are so recent, a British nation, with two cities of half a million each and with other populous centres, has grown up in the southern hemisphere. Its potential resources cannot yet be measured, but are undoubtedly on a very large scale. It has hardly known the sound of war. Nelson's victory at Trafalgar left Britain so strong upon the sea that no fleet hostile to her has been able to approach Australia. Even when vast stretches of the coast were unoccupied, Britain was able to warn off intruders and to make good her claim to the whole land.

The Australian colonies followed Canada not only in securing complete constitutional liberty; the further advantages of federation also became apparent to them. In 1900 the British Parliament passed the necessary act, and on January 1, 1901, the Commonwealth of Australia came into existence. It is the second great federal state within the British Empire. The resemblance between the Australian and Canadian systems is marked, especially in the provisions that the ministry of the day is responsible to Parliament, and that an appeal to the electors may take place at any time; but in some other respects the newer federation

The federal
commonwealth
of Australia.

has followed more closely the pattern of the United States. Its divisions are not provinces, but states; it has an elective Senate, instead of one appointed by the Crown, a House of Representatives instead of a House of Commons; and the states in Australia, as in the United States, retain all the powers not specifically assigned to the federal government, while in Canada it is the powers of the provinces that are strictly defined. The island of Tasmania is a part of Australia, but New Zealand, about a thousand miles distant, is a separate colony. Its length of 900 miles gives some idea of the extent of a state, small as compared with Australia or Canada. The native Maoris are perhaps the most virile race in the South Seas, and they fiercely opposed the coming of the Europeans. In New Zealand life they still are an important element.

The Cape of Good Hope, the nucleus of the present British possessions in South Africa, was occupied by the Dutch in 1652, and became an important station on their trading route to India. Huguenots driven from France, Dutch soldiers returned from India, a few settlers from Holland, comprised the chief colonists. Cape Town itself was strictly governed by the Dutch, but the settlers in the interior beyond it, who came to be known as Boers, lived an independent life, and had little regard for any external authority. During the Napoleonic War, when France dominated Holland, Indian officials urged the importance to Britain of holding the Cape as a station on the way to the East. Already in 1795 there had been a temporary occupation, and finally in 1806, the year after Trafalgar, a powerful British fleet sailed into Table Bay, landed an army of 7,000 men, and after some fighting established British rule. For many years there were few British settlers, and the governors had the difficult problem of ruling a colony composed of alien Dutch, and of controlling the adjacent and warlike native tribes. From the first there were race

The British in
South Africa.

[illegible]

35 20' Longitude East 25' from Greenwich



troubles, and ever since South Africa has known no long interval of peace.

The Boer farmers, dependent upon native slave-labour, were half ruined in 1833 when slavery was abolished in British dominions. To meet the demands of philanthropists, who carried on an agitation against alleged Boer cruelty to the enslaved natives, the British tried more strictly to impose their authority upon the farmers, and the Boers, to avoid it, "trekked" farther and farther north. British policy was changeful and unstable, while the Boers, who founded in the far interior two states, known later as the Orange Free State and the South African Republic, always knew what they wanted—independence, and the right to adopt their own methods with the negro tribes. The British were drawn into strife not only with the natives of the country, Kaffirs and Zulus, but also with the Boers. These threw off allegiance to Britain, defeated the British in 1881 at Laing's Neck and Majuba Hill, and won self-government under British suzerainty. In time the interior was found to have great wealth in diamonds and gold. Speculators poured in, and finally, in 1899, the two states—the South African Republic, better known as the Transvaal, and the Orange Free State, whose self-government Britain had permitted, and even encouraged—joined in a war upon her because she demanded that easy conditions of securing the franchise should be granted to the many British citizens then residing in the country. A struggle, surprising for the military skill which the Boers displayed, ended with the annexation of the two states to Britain. But an army of more than 250,000 men, and the skill of generals like Lord Roberts and Lord Kitchener, were necessary to secure this result, while the feat of sending this great host thousands of miles by sea to the scene of war is unparalleled in military history. Though now the four regions, Cape Colony, Natal, the Orange River State,

The conflict
with the Dutch
in South Africa.

and the Transvaal, all have separate governments, probably in time a third self-governing federal state within the British Empire will appear in South Africa. It will be of vast extent. Besides the colonies named, running far northward there are great stretches of territory over which Britain holds sway, and ardent British imperialism sometimes talks of possessing ultimately a continuous stretch of British territory from Egypt to Cape Colony.

While the growth of territory so far outlined is striking, it is even more remarkable that Britain should rule

The opening in
India for Euro-
pean methods. three hundred millions in India, distant from
her by about six thousand miles. Were India
itself a single nation, such a foreign sway
would probably be impossible. But India represents
many nations. Lying between the sea bordering South-
ern Asia and the almost impregnable mountain ranges
which shut it in on the north, this vast region, though
not without a certain geographical unity, has a greater
variety of peoples than the whole continent of Europe.
There are in it highly civilized states and almost savage
tribes, fully two hundred different languages, and a hun-
dred different religions. From time immemorial the
people of India have been accustomed to the sway of the
foreign conqueror, who entered through the mountain
passes of the north; the last conqueror, Britain, is the
only one to approach from the sea. Her alien rule is, to
the mass of the natives, strange only in its orderly char-
acter. During the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries
the great Moghuls, a warlike race of Moslem Turks, held
sway at Delhi over a great part of India, but soon after
1700 their authority was almost gone. The Turk showed
in India, as elsewhere, his incapacity for orderly govern-
ment. Defined frontiers hardly existed, brigandage and
oppression were everywhere, and it is estimated that not
less than two million armed men were ready to sell their
services to any adventurous leader who displayed his abil-

ity to pay them. Discipline in the European sense was unknown, and the oppressed people longed for, rather than dreaded, new conquerors strong enough to protect life and property.

In the eighteenth century an acute observer said that ten thousand disciplined troops could conquer India, and the ease of the task became in time apparent. Several European states had great trading interests in the country, and it was almost inevitable that to one of them should fall the duty of preserving order. It was no accident that gave this to Britain, for time showed that she alone had a secure basis of support in her control of sea communication with Europe. But only after centuries of European rivalry was this truth clear. During the sixteenth century Portugal had the rich Indian trade to herself; but in 1580, when Spain annexed Portugal and her possessions, England and Holland attacked them, and by the end of the century found their way into the East and became rivals for the Indian trade. The Dutch long had the advantage. Their East India Company, finally organized in 1602, had a far larger capital than that of the English Company founded in 1600. Civil war in England under Charles I aided the interests of the Dutch, but later the English Commonwealth attacked Holland vigorously, with the result that in India the Dutch soon devoted their attention to the islands, leaving to England the mainland. In India itself the French then became the chief rivals of England, but neither state aimed as yet at direct empire. They strove rather for a monopoly of trade. In time, with the consent of native rulers, the rival trading companies fortified stations on the coast, as a basis of their operations, and before the end of the seventeenth century there were British stations at Madras, Bombay, and Calcutta. Pondicherry was the chief French station. While the English Company had


Britain's struggle with other powers for supremacy in India.

in time great wealth, and lent the Government something like £4,000,000, the French East India Company was always weak; it paid dividends when it had not earned them, and instead of lending to France, borrowed from her £6,000,000, and thus gave the French Government the right to meddlesome official interference, which it freely used. Dupleix, the Governor of Pondicherry, the ablest administrator France sent out, adopted boldly the plan of alliance with native rulers to drive out the English, and of making France not only a trading but a military power in India. But his few successes were in vain. France, without sea-power, had no basis of communications, and when he was recalled, in 1754, he had accomplished nothing stable.

Then came the supreme struggle. Renewed war broke out in 1756. In India the British were now led by the brilliant Clive, both a statesman and the only general who rivals the fame of Wolfe during this period. Though the English had a fortified post at Calcutta, they were merely tenants of Surajah Dowlah, the Nabob of Bengal, who, incited by the French to believe that his rights had been violated, seized the English in the place and perpetrated, in 1756, the terrible outrage of the Black Hole of Calcutta, in which about 130 English men and women were suffocated in a single night. This event really led to the final establishment of British political power in India. Clive, with only 7,000 troops in the service of the East India Company, defeated the Rajah's 40,000 at Plassey in 1757, and Bengal, then the richest province of India, became really British territory. When in 1760 the British held the fort of Wandewash against France and her allies they had really secured Madras. Pondicherry fell in 1761, and with it France's power in India.

After the peace of 1763 the British had no serious rivals, and their chief task was that of keeping order

Final winning
of British
supremacy in
India.



among the native states so that profitable trade should be possible. With Bengal occupied by the forces of the

The growth of
British domin-
ion in India.

East India Company, the singular situation was created of a trading company ruling and administering the revenues of a great state.


As much as £2,000,000 passed annually to the British Government from the company; the net profits which the company itself had in 1765 were £1,700,000, and it paid dividends of twelve and a half per cent. But dark days came. There was famine in 1770; the company defaulted in its payments to the government, and in 1773 had to borrow £1,400,000. Parliament then seized the opportunity to assert its own authority, and an act of 1773 gave a parliamentary title for the first time to the company's rule in India and provided for some control over its affairs. From that date two facts stand



ROBERT, LORD CLIVE
(1725-1774).

out most clearly in India: the growth of British territory through the attraction which the one orderly and stable government exercised, and the increased watchfulness of the British Parliament in regard to the company's rule. The only discreditable era was that after Plassey, when the traders had Bengal at their mercy, and no legal checks upon extortion were yet matured. Those were the days when vast fortunes were amassed rapidly, and the successful founders returned home to buy their way into Parliament and good society. But British rule meant in time order and justice, and to it the oppressed peoples turned. Of course the native rulers preferred independence. Incessant war was necessary, but in fifty years the chief part of the work was completed.

Warren Hastings, the first Governor-General, a new office established by Parliament, ruled India from 1774 to 1785. When Britain was engaged in war with her American colonies and with France, Spain, and Holland, France made a last effort to regain India. At her instigation, Hyder Ali of Mysore and other native rulers attacked the British, whose fortunes for a time sank very low. Warren Hastings was hard pressed for money; undoubtedly he raised the necessary revenues in a high-handed manner, and thus gave



WARREN HASTINGS
(1732-1818).

Burke the ground for the impeachment which led to the famous trial lasting seven years. But the first Governor-General was an able and patriotic statesman, who made Britain's rule in India finally secure at the very time that America was lost. Napoleon's expedition to Egypt in 1798 was an avowed attempt to strike British supremacy in India. An army of ten or twenty thousand men with such a leader could have made great conquests; but Napo-

leon failed, as France had failed before, for want of naval communication with his base. Meanwhile British sway in India continued to extend in spite of the efforts of the home government to check it. By 1805, when the Governor-General, Lord Wellesley, was recalled, its area was enormous, and the annexations of territory continued long after the conclusion of peace in Europe in 1815; even to this day no one can say that final frontiers have been defined for the British dominions.

It is in the seasons when Britain has been engaged in

European war that the restlessness of India has become marked. The Crimean War shook Britain's military reputation, and it was industriously urged by the enemies of Britain in India that she could be driven out. The experiences of the Crimean War caused a change to improved weapons, and anti-British intriguers told the Hindoo soldiers, who reverence the cow, and the Mohammedans, who think the pig unclean, that the new cartridges were oiled with cow's and pig's grease, practices that most of the native soldiers regarded with horror. There were other and complex causes of discontent, and finally, in 1857, a terrible revolt broke out. In it the populace took little part; it was mainly a soldiers' rising and was confined to the Bengal provinces; Madras and Bombay remained quiet, and even in Bengal the mutiny was not universal. The horrors perpetrated by the rebels show how thin was the veneer of civilization in India. There were famous sieges of Delhi, Lucknow, and Cawnpore. Canning, the Governor-General, and such generals as Sir Colin Campbell (afterward Lord Clyde), Sir Hugh Rose, Havelock, and Lawrence showed tact and, above all, courage in dealing with the rebels, and by 1858 British supremacy in India, after a frightful ordeal, was more secure than ever.

In its wake the mutiny brought political change, for the British Parliament finally deposed the East India Company in 1858 and assumed the direct responsibility of government. Now the Secretary of State for India sits in Parliament, he is a member of the Cabinet, and is responsible to the nation for what is done in India. On the north India's frontiers touch China, but the neighbour that Britain most dreads is Russia. That great empire has spread eastward and southward in Asia, and now only the independent state of Afghanistan lies between Russia and the mountain passes which lead into northern India. Persia, influenced by

The Indian
mutiny.

Present-day
problems in
India.

Russia, was menacing the western borders of Afghanistan in 1837, and the British Government was then obliged to lay down the principle that the integrity of Afghanistan is necessary to the safety of India. Since then British armies have more than once forced their way to the Afghan capital, Kabul, to insure the tenure of the throne by a ruler friendly to Britain. The Russian danger is still much in men's minds in India. The railway now plays a great part in the defence of the northwestern frontier, and Britain is in a position to amass troops rapidly at any threatened point.

British rule has resulted in untold benefits to India, for it has brought law and order out of chaotic disorder and unrest. Native princes still rule Indian states, but Britain controls their foreign

Britain's work
in India.

affairs and their armies, and the British sovereign is universally recognised as the supreme ruler. Everywhere Britain guarantees liberty of opinion; the natives of India are practically as free as those of Britain in this respect—a condition hardly found in any other Oriental country. “Firmly relying ourselves on the truth of Christianity,” said Queen Victoria in assuming the direct government of India in 1858, “and acknowledging with gratitude the solace of religion, we disclaim alike the right and the desire to impose our convictions on any of our subjects.” To this policy Britain has been true. Liberty has promoted discussion. There is a new movement of ideas in this stagnant East, and it may be that by encouraging education, independent thought and action, Britain is forging the weapon which in the end may overthrow her own rule. No state has hitherto succeeded permanently in the task of governing great dependencies. But for the present Britain's supremacy is secure, and it has brought increased happiness and liberty to those she governs.

The lines upon which further expansion and coloniza-

tion by the European powers can proceed are now defined with some precision. By the Monroe Doctrine, a cardinal feature of the foreign policy of the United States, America is no longer open to the ambitions of European states; and in 1890 the chief European powers reached an agreement in regard to spheres of influence in Africa. In Asia, Britain is ever nervous about the designs of Russia as a possible menace to India, and some agreement with that state is her most urgent present-day need. Meanwhile in every sea she has advantages the aggregate of which is equalled by no other power. In the Suez Canal and Gibraltar she holds the approaches to the Mediterranean Sea from both the east and the west; and the Cape of Good Hope gives her control also of the longer route to the east around Africa. Aden gives her command of the Red Sea, and her influence in the world of Islam has so grown that she rules more Moslems than does the Turk; and Mecca itself is not unlikely to fall within her influence. She commands, too, the sea routes of both the Atlantic and the Pacific. Undoubtedly Britain can no longer hope to maintain unrivalled supremacy in the world's trade; the modern ease of transporting products has made not only the United States and Germany, but the British colonies themselves, her rivals even in her own home markets. Progress involves such changes and readjustments, but in influence and wealth Britain still stands in the first rank, and shows no sign of declining from it.

NOTE.—The population of the British Empire may be briefly summarized as follows:

I. Population almost entirely of European origin:

England (in 1901).....	32,526,075
Scotland “	4,472,000
Ireland “	4,456,546
Canada “	5,369,666
Australia “ (without aborigines)	3,767,443
South Africa (estimated).....	1,000,000

I. Population almost entirely of European origin (*continued*):

New Zealand (in 1901).....	772,719	
Malta "	183,679	
Europeans in India (estimated).....	100,000	
West Indies and Bermuda (estimated)	100,000	
Gibraltar (in 1901)	27,460	
Other parts of empire, say	24,412	
	<hr/>	52,800,000

II. Population almost entirely of other than

European origin :

India (estimated).....	294,874,411	
Ceylon and Eastern colonies (estimated)	4,298,974	
West Indies (estimated).....	1,650,000	
South Africa (estimated).....	5,000,000	
British Central Africa (estimated)...	3,000,000	
British East Africa (estimated).....	6,550,000	
British West Africa (estimated).....	40,000,000	
Australasia and islands.....	661,700	
Other regions, say.....	164,915	
	<hr/>	356,200,000

Total population..... 409,000,000

SUMMARY OF DATES

John Cabot raised the English flag in America in 1497. In 1583 England took formal possession of her first American colony, Newfoundland. The **Charter of the East India Company was granted in 1600**. Virginia, the first successful English colony on the mainland of America, was founded in 1607. The English occupied Barbados in the West Indies in 1624, and the East India Company occupied St. Helena in 1651. Jamaica was conquered from Spain in 1655. Bombay was ceded by Portugal to England in 1661, and New York was captured from the Dutch in 1664. The Calcutta station began in 1696. **The Treaty of Utrecht in 1713** gave Britain **Gibraltar**, and France renounced claims on **Nova Scotia, Newfoundland, and Hudson's Bay** in North America. War with France broke out in America in 1744, and continued with only a few years' interruption until 1763. Britain secured Bengal by the **victory of Plassey in 1757**, and Madras by that of **Wandewash in 1760**, which insured the fall of French power in India. **Quebec was taken in 1759**, and the **Peace of Paris in 1763** made final the overthrow of France in North America and India. **Captain Cook occupied Australia in 1770**. **The Treaty of Versailles in 1783**

confirmed the independence of the United States, and took from Britain the most advanced part of her colonial empire. **New South Wales was founded in 1788. Britain seized the Cape of Good Hope in 1806, and the Treaty of Paris in 1814 confirmed to her this and other possessions. New Zealand was annexed in 1839, and Natal was proclaimed a British Colony in 1843. Upper and Lower Canada were united in 1841. Responsible government soon followed in Canada, and it was conceded to the Australian colonies after 1850. Annexation continued in India (especially Punjab in 1849, Oudh in 1856), and the Mutiny broke out in 1857. Victoria was proclaimed Sovereign of India in 1858, the Moghul dynasty then ended, and India passed from the control of the East India Company to that of the British Crown. The Dominion of Canada was formed in 1867. The Suez Canal was opened in 1869, and though built largely by French capital, it passed finally under British control in 1882. Victoria was proclaimed Empress of India in 1877. The status of the Transvaal was defined by the Convention of London in 1884. Extensive annexations were made in South and East Africa between 1885 and 1890, and in 1890 the powers concerned agreed in defining their spheres of influence in Africa. British forces occupied Egypt in 1882, and Britain still administers that country. The war with the Boer Republics in 1899 ended with their annexation in 1902. The federation of Australia was completed in 1901.**

BOOKS FOR REFERENCE

Mahan, *The Influence of Sea-Power upon History, 1660-1783* (1890); Egerton, *Short History of British Colonial Policy* (1898); Woodward, *Short History of the Expansion of the British Empire* (1899); * Seeley, *Expansion of England* (1895); Bourinot, *Canada (Story of the Nations)* (1897); * Parkman, *Montcalm and Wolfe* (2 vols., 1900); * Jenks, *The Australasian Colonies* (1895); * Reeves, *Long White Cloud (History of New Zealand)* (1898); * Theal, *South Africa (Story of the Nations)* (1897); Bryce, *Impressions of South Africa* (1899); * Lyall, *The Rise of the British Dominions in India* (1898); Holmes, *History of the Indian Mutiny* (1888).

I N D E X

- Abdul Medjid, Sultan, 532.
 Abelard, 165.
 Aberdeen, George Hamilton Gordon, fourth Earl of, 531, 534.
 Aboukir Bay, battle of, 501.
 Abyssinian War, 535.
 Acre, 122.
 Acton Burnell Manor-house, 158.
 Adam of Orilton, Bishop of Winchester, 184.
 Adams, Samuel, 466, 467.
 Addington, Henry, Viscount Sidmouth, 502, 514, 515, 516.
 Addison, Joseph, 491.
 Adela, Stephen's mother, 89.
 Aden, 583.
 Adrian IV, Pope, 102.
 "Advertisements of Elizabeth," 316.
 Afghanistan, 581, 582.
 Africa, 513; East and West, 535; North, 396, 535; South, 546, **574-576**.
 Agincourt, battle of, 208, 244.
 Agricola, 22, 74.
 Agriculture, 4, 5, 6; Celtic, 11; early British, 19; Roman, 29; taught by monks, 36, 278; eleventh century, **62-64**, 69; thirteenth century, **139-140**; at close of Medieval period, **249-251**; Elizabethan period, **328**; 475; eighteenth century village, **477-479**; Irish, 542; nineteenth century, **563**; Canadian, 569.
 Aidan, 34.
 Aix-la-Chapelle, treaty of, 451.
 Alabama affair, 536.
 Alaric, 26.
 Albert of Saxe-Coburg-Gotha, Prince Consort, 523, 524.
 Albigenes, 118.
 Alcuin, 36.
 Alençon, Duke of, 306, 307.
 Alexander III, Pope, 98.
 Alexander I, Czar, 504.
 Alexander of Hales, 168.
 Alfred the Great, 36, **41-42**, 70, 74, 340.
 Alfred, brother of Edward the Confessor, 48, 52.
 Algiers, 396.
 Allen, William, Cardinal, 306.
 Alma, battle of the, 533.
 Alva, Duke of, 305.
 America, 2, 216; discovery of, 202, 239; 240, 266; 317, 318, 326, 328, 337, 350, 351, 358, 395, 397, 427.
 American Revolution, 457, **463-473**, 483, 509, 540, 541, 570.
 Amherst, General Jeffrey, 453.
 Amiens, Mise of, 120; peace of, 501.
 Amusements, 15, 19, 24, 28, 66, 67, 69, 89, 142, 164, 171, 243, 260, 261, 267, 321, 334, 335, 392.
 Angevin Line, 92; Dominions, 103.
 Angles, 27, 30, 74.
 Anglesea, 22.
 Anglia, East, 27, 45.
 Anjou, 51, 93, 111, 214.
 Animals in Britain, 1, 4, 5, 8, 9, 19, 29, 65, 89, 249, 258.
 Annates, 276.

- Anne, of Bohemia, 195.
 Anne, of Cleves, 286.
 Anne, Queen, 423, 425, **436-442**, 444, 486.
 Anselm, Abbot of Bec, Archbishop of Canterbury, 85, 86, 88, 98.
 Anson, George, first Baron, admiral, 449.
 Anti-Corn Law League, 526.
 Antwerp, 327.
 Aquinas, Thomas, 106.
 Aquitaine, 118, 128, 173, 181, 182, 183.
 Arabi Pasha, 535.
 Archangel, 326.
 Architecture, 47, 48, 106, 151, 257, 329, 560; Norman, 151, 152, 153, 157; early English, 153, 154, 257; decorated, 154, 155, 156, 256, 257; perpendicular, 257; window, 258; interior, 259; 329; Renaissance, 329, 330, 492; 560.
 Argyle, Archibald Campbell, eighth Earl of, and also Marquis of, 384, 429.
 Argyle, Archibald Campbell, ninth Earl of, 420, 430.
 Argyle, John Campbell, Marquis and afterward Duke of, 442, 443.
 Arianism, 18, 30.
 Arkwright, Sir Richard, 480.
 Arlington, Henry Bennet, Earl of, 414, 432.
 Armada, Spanish, **311-315**, 432.
 Armour, 162, 163; chain, 162; plate, 162, 163, 178, 243, 244, 245, 335.
 Arms, Assize of, 101.
 Arms. Longbow, 163; crossbow, 163; archers, 177; small fire-arms, 216, 217, 335; guns, 312; hand-guns, 216, 558; caliver, 334; pike, 335.
 Arnold, Dr. Thomas, 553.
 Arnold, Matthew, 560.
 Art, in thirteenth century, 159, 160; in fifteenth century, 258, 260, 266; English school, 329, 447; in eighteenth century, 492; in nineteenth century, 560.
 Arthur, King, 27, 265.
 Arthur, Prince, murdered by John, 110.
 Artillery, 180, 181, 207; French, 215; modern, 558.
 Arundel, Richard Fitzalan, Earl of, 195.
 Arundel, Thomas, Archbishop of Canterbury, 205.
 Asceline, 83.
 Ascham, Roger, 325.
 Ashanti War, 535.
 Ashingham, 62.
 Ashley, Lord. See **SHAFTESBURY, SEVENTH EARL OF**.
 Aske, Robert, rebel, 284.
 Askew, Ann, 285.
 Assembly of Church of Scotland. See **SCOTTISH CHURCH**.
 Assembly of Divines at Westminster, 365, 366, 371.
 Assembly, National, of France, 497.
 Assiento Treaty, 441, 444.
 Aston, Sir Arthur, 381.
 Athelstan, 42.
 Atherton Moor, battle of, 368.
 Attainder, bill of, 286, 364, 436.
 Atterbury, Francis, Bishop of Rochester, 443.
 Audeley, Thomas, Baron, 282.
 Auerstädt, battle, 503.
 Augusta, Princess of Wales, 457.
 Augustine, St., first Archbishop of Canterbury, **31-33**, 70, 74.
 Austerlitz, battle of, 502, 503.
 Austria, 450, 451, 457, 461, 497, 502, 512, 513, 532, 533.
 Austrian Succession, War of the, 450-451.
 Australia, 483, 493, 513, 565, **569-574**.
 Avignon, 106, 170, 184, 189.
 Aylesbury, 255.
 Babington, Anthony, conspirator, 308.
 Bacon, Francis, Baron Veru-

- lam, 325, 337, 343, **348-349**, 489.
 Bacon, Roger, 106.
 Badajos, 505.
 Balacava, battle of, 533.
 Balfour, Arthur James, 545, 547.
 Ball, John, rebel, 191, 193.
 Ballard, John, conspirator, 308.
 Balliol, John, King of Scotland, 123, 129.
 Ballot Bill, 556.
 Baltic Sea, 531.
 Bancroft, Richard, Archbishop of Canterbury, 342.
 Bank of England, 435, 500.
 Bannockburn, battle of, 172, 175, 337.
 Baptists, 398, 409.
 Barbados, 396, 397.
 Barebones, Praise God, 389.
 Barnet, battle of, 226; 2d, 229.
 Barons, Rufus struggles with, 84; Henry I struggles with, 87; independence of, under Stephen, 90-92; revolt of, under Henry II, 100-102, 104; oppose John, 113, 114; 117, 120, 125, 172, 173, 174, 225; depression of, by Henry VII, 236; power and state of, in fifteenth century, 242, 243; lawlessness of, 244, 245; checks upon retainers, 246. See House of Lords under PARLIAMENT.
 Barré, Colonel, 498.
 Barrows, Henry, separatist, 317.
 Bate, John, 346.
 Bath, 25, 503.
 Battle, town, 58; Abbey, 59.
 Baxter, Richard, 487, 490.
 Bayeux, 99.
 Bayeux, Bishop of. See ODO.
 Bayeux tapestry, 57.
 Beaconsfield, Benjamin Disraeli, Earl of, 524, 526, 528, **538-539**.
 Beaton, Cardinal, 339.
 Beaufort, Edmund, Duke of Somerset, 217.
 Beaufort, Cardinal, 213, 214, 217.
 Becket, Thomas á, Archbishop of Canterbury, **95-99**, 278, 281.
 Bede, the Venerable, 35, 43, 70.
 Bedford, John, Duke of, **211-213**, 216.
 Bedford, 409.
 Bell, Henry, inventor, 548.
 Bellingham, assassin, 504.
 Benedict Biscop, 64.
 "Benevolences," 227, 237, 270, 288, 347.
 Bengal, 452, 453, 472, 578, 579, 581.
 Bentinck, William, first Earl of Portland, 436.
 Beowulf, 69, 70.
 Beresford family, 518.
 Bergen, 55.
 Berkeley Castle, 157, 174.
 Berkhamstead, 60.
 Berlin decree of Napoleon, 503.
 Berlin, Congress of, 536, 539.
 Bermuda, 565.
 Bernard of Clairvaux, 77.
 Bernicia, division of England, 39.
 Bertha, Queen, 31.
 Berwick, 361; treaty of, 362.
 Bethnal Green, 485.
 Bible, the English. Tyndale's, 285; Authorized, 351.
 Birmingham, 514, 519.
 Bishops, Seven, the trial and acquittal of, 423.
 Bishops' Courts, 143.
 Black Death. See DISEASE.
 Black Heath, 191, 405.
 Black Hole of Calcutta, 452, 453, 578.
 Black Prince. See EDWARD, PRINCE OF WALES.
 Blake, Robert; admiral, 386, 387, 396, 397.
 Blenheim, battle of, 438.
 Bloody Assize, 420.
 Blücher, Field Marshal von, 507.
 Boadicea, Queen, 22, 74.
 Bodleian Library, 211.
 Boers, 574, 575.
 Boer War, 513, 546, 575.

- Boleyn, Anne, 272, 275, 277, 278, 285, 298.
 Bolingbroke, Henry St. John, Viscount, 441-443.
 Bologna, 94, 166.
 Bombay, 575, 581.
 Bonaparte, Louis Napoleon.
 See NAPOLEON III.
 Boniface VIII, Pope, 106, 125.
 Boniface, Archbishop of Canterbury, 117.
 Bonner, Edmund, Bishop of London, 290, 296, 301.
 Book of Common Prayer, 291, 294, 301, 342, 361, 371, 408, 437.
 Bordeaux, 179.
 Borough-on-Sands, 130.
 Borrow, George, 562.
 Boston, 464, 465; Massacre, 467; "Tea Party," 468, 469, 470.
 Bosworth Field, battle of, 232, 236, 263.
 Botany Bay, 570.
 Bothwell, James Hepburn, Earl of, 304.
 Boulogne, 288, 502.
 Bouvines, battle of, 113.
 Boyne, battle of the, 431.
 Braddock, General, 451, 486.
 Bradford, 368.
 Bradlaugh, Charles, 556.
 Braemar, 443.
 Bray, Sir Reginald, 238.
 Brest, 501.
 Brétigny, Treaty of, 181.
 Bride, St., Massacre of, 33, 44.
 Bridget, St., 33.
 Bridgewater, Duke of, 476.
 Bridgewater, 420.
 Bright, John, 526.
 Brindley, James, engineer, 476.
 Bristol, 28, 255, 258, 368, 392, 489, 519.
 British Dominions, growth of, 565-583.
 British North America Act, 568.
 Brown, Robert, separatist, 316, 317.
 Browning, Robert, 560.
 Bruce, David, 174, 178.
 Bruce, Robert, 123, 130; defeats Edward II, 172; 337, 338.
 Buckingham, Henry Stafford, Duke of, 229, 232.
 Buckingham, Edward Stafford, Duke of, beheaded, 269, 274.
 Buckingham, George Villiers, Duke of, **347-355**, 359.
 Buckingham, George Villiers, second Duke of, 414.
 Bunker Hill, battle of, 470.
 Bunyan, John, 409, 490.
 Bures, 99.
 Burghley, Lord. See CECIL, SIR WILLIAM.
 Burgundy, 228.
 Burgundy, Duke of, 207.
 Burke, Edmund, 449, 473, 499, 500, 580.
 Burke, Thomas Henry, 543, 544.
 Burnell, Bishop, 124.
 Burnet, Gilbert, Bishop of Salisbury, 433.
 Burns, Robert, 492.
 Bury St. Edmunds, 214.
 Bute, John Stewart, third Earl of, 456, 458, 464.
 Butler, Dame Alice, 209.
 Butler, Lady, 229.
 Butt, Isaac, 542.
 Buxton, Sir Thomas Fowell, 520.
 Byng, George, admiral, 452, 454.
 Byron, George Gordon, Lord, 560.
 Cabot, John, 239.
 Cade, Jack, rebellion of, 215, 216.
 Cadiz, 354.
 Caedmon, 69.
 Caen, 83.
 Cæsar, Julius, 20, 21.
 Caister Castle, 244.
 Calais, 78, 181, 207, 215, 224, 298, 313, 397.
 Calcutta, 575, 578.
 Caledonians, 26.
 California, 219, 573.
 Calvin, John, 266.

- Calvinism, 354, 357.
 Cambridge, Richard Plantagenet, Earl of, 207.
 Cambridge University. See UNIVERSITIES.
 Campbell, Sir Colin, Lord Clyde, 581.
 Campbell. See ARGYLE, DUKE OF.
 Campeggio, Bishop of Salisbury, 272.
 Camperdown, battle of, 501.
 Campion, Edmund, Jesuit, 306.
 Canada, 397, 453, 454, 465, 470, 472, 506, 513, 541, 561, **566-569**, 572, 573.
 Canadian Pacific Railway, 569.
 Canals, development of, 476.
 Canning, George, 516, 517, 526, 581.
 Canon law, 94.
 Canossa, Castle of, 77.
 Canterbury, 47, 60, 99, 116, 153, 278, 281.
 Cantilupe, Bishop of Worcester, 117.
 Canute, King, 44, 45, 48, 60.
 Cape Breton, 450.
 Cape Coast Castle, 486.
 Cape Colony, 507, 536, **574-576**.
 Cape of Good Hope, 240, 326, 583.
 Cape Horn, 319, 449.
 Cape St. Vincent, 501.
 Cape Town, 574.
 Cape Trafalgar, 502.
 Caradoc, or Caractacus, 21.
 Carham, battle of, 337.
 Caribbean Sea, 396.
 Carisbrooke Castle, 373, 375.
 Carlisle, 23, 86, 129.
 Carlyle, Thomas, 561.
 Caroline of Anspach, queen of George II, 446, 447, 493.
 Caroline of Brunswick, queen of George IV, 516.
 Carr, Robert, Earl of Somerset, 347.
 Cartagena, 449.
 Carteret, John, Earl Granville, 450.
 Cartwright, Edmund, inventor, 480.
 Cartwright, Thomas, divine, 316.
 Castile, 202.
 Castillon, battle of, 215.
 Castle, the mediæval, 154, 156-158.
 Castlereagh, Viscount. See STEWART, ROBERT.
 Catesby, Robert, conspirator, 343, 344, 345.
 Catherine of Aragon, 234, 238, 267, 272, 275, 277, 285, 295.
 Catherine II, of Russia, 457.
 Catholic Relief Bill, 517, 518, 556.
 Cato Street Conspiracy, 515.
 "Cavaliers," 366, 400, 405, 409, 410.
 Cavendish, George, 282.
 Cavendish, Lord Frederick, 543.
 Cawnpore, 534, 581.
 Caxton, William, 230, 265.
 Cecil, Robert, Earl of Salisbury, 321, 347.
 Cecil, Sir William, Lord Burghley, 300, 302, 303, 305, 315, 316, 321, 347, 354.
 Celtic culture, 11.
 Cervantes, 243, 266.
 Ceylon, 472, 507.
 Chalgrove Field, 368.
 Chalmers, Dr. Thomas, 254, 255.
 Chaluz-Chabrol, Castle of, 109.
 Chamberlain, Joseph, 544.
 Chancellor, Sir Richard, 326.
 Chancery, Court of, 389, 398.
 Charing Cross, 406.
 Charlemagne, 36, 39.
 Charles I, 187, **349-375**; execution, 376, 377; 379, 380, 381, 383, 386, 392, 406, 419, 424.
 Charles II, 227, 228, 380-382, 384, **404-419**, 420, 428, 429, 430, 432, 437, 490.
 Charles IV, of France, 175.
 Charles V, of France, 180.
 Charles VI, of France, 207, 208, 211.

Charles VII, of France, 208, 211, 212, 213.
 Charles VIII, of France, 202.
 Charles (the Simple), 46, 47.
 Charles IV, Emperor, 195.
 Charles V, Emperor, 269, 270, 272, 296.
 Charles II, of Spain, 436.
 Charles Edward (the Young Pretender), 450.
 Charles the Bold, Duke of Burgundy, 228.
 Charter House Priors, 276, 277.
 Charter of Liberties issued by Henry I, 87.
 Chartists, the, 530.
 Chateley Manor, 308.
 Châteauf Gaillard, siege of, 110, 111.
 Chatham, Earl of. See **PITT, WILLIAM**.
 Chaucer, Geoffrey, 169, 198, 264, 265.
 Chelsea, 277.
 Chelt, battle of, 304.
 Cheltenham School, 559.
 Chemistry, 180, 557.
 Chester, 25, 28, 78.
 China, 531, 532, 534, 535, 582.
 Chinon, 103.
 Chivalry, 84; principles of, **137-138**, 171, 176, 178, 183; decline of, 243, 326.
 Chloroform, 558.
 Christianity, spread of, 18; religion of Roman empire, 26, 28, 30-32; accepted by all Britain, 33; in Ireland, 33; in Scotland, 34. See also **CHURCH**.
 Church, Early British, 32-34; 42, 43, 65; Roman, power of, 30; reorganizes English, 35, 36, 42, 43, 46, 52, 65; reformed by Gregory VII, 76, 77; system of law, 80; makes Rufus King, 84; refuses Christian burial to Rufus, 86; power of increases, 92; struggles with Henry II, **94-99**, 106, 107; conflict with John, 112, 113, 115; checked by Edward I, 124; power in

thirteenth century, **131-136**; mendicant movement, 135; right of sanctuary, 147; influence undermined, 170; power restricted, 184, 185; attacked by Wycliffe, **189**; checked by Richard II, 195, 201, 202; condemns Huss, 206, 228; decline of in fifteenth century, **247-249**, 253, 266; overthrow of power under Henry VIII, **271-285**. See **CHURCH OF ENGLAND**, **CHURCH OF ROME**, **CHURCH OF SCOTLAND**.
 Church of England, after break with Rome, **271-285**, 286, 290; Prayer Book, 291; robbery of, 293, 294; Protestant settlement under Edward VI, **294**, 301; overthrow under Mary, **296-298**; Protestant settlement under Elizabeth, **301**, 305; effect of Armada upon, 315; persecution of Nonconformists, **315-317**; under James I, **342**; under Laud, **356-358**, 360, 361, 366; overthrown by Puritans, **371**, 383, 390; under Cromwell, **398-399**; restored, **407**; intolerance of, **407-410**, 414, 415, 422, 433, 437; High and Low, 440; in eighteenth century, Wesley in, **487-489**; 500; Tractarian movement, **553**; revenues redistributed, 554; power curtailed, 554; schools of, 559.
 Church of Rome, after break with England, 271, 273, 275, 276, 290; restored by Mary, **296-298**; Elizabeth breaks with, **301**, 305, 306; effect of Armada upon, **315**, 316, 339, 341; persecution of, under James I and Gunpowder Plot, **343-346**; 358, 379, 413, 415; persecution of, under Charles II, **415-416**; James II attempts to re-establish, **421-427**; in Ireland under

- William III, **431-432**, 443, 470, 500; in Ireland, **508**; final relief for, **517-518**, 559.
- Church of Scotland. See PRESBYTERIANISM.
- Church Missionary Society, 552.
- Churchill, John, Duke of Marlborough, **437-441**, 493.
- Cistercians. See MONASTERIES.
- Ciudad Rodrigo, 505.
- Clare, Richard de, Earl of Striguil, 102.
- Clarence, Thomas, Duke of, 204.
- Clarence, George, Duke of, **224-227**, 230.
- Clarendon, Earl of. See HYDE, EDWARD.
- Clarendon, Henry Hyde, second Earl of, 421.
- Clarkson, Thomas, philanthropist, 487.
- Claudius Cæsar, 21.
- Clement V, Pope, 106.
- Clement VII, Pope, 272, 275.
- Clement XIV, Pope, 457.
- Clifford, Thomas, 414.
- Clifton, School, 559.
- Climate, 1-5, 15.
- Clinton, Lord, 282.
- Clive, Robert, Lord, 453, 493, **578-579**.
- Cluny, 135.
- Clyde, Sir Colin Campbell, Lord, 581.
- Clyde, shipbuilding of, 5, 22.
- Coal-fields, 6; pits, 476, 480.
- Cobbett, William, 514, 551.
- Cobden, Richard, 526, 550.
- Cobham, Eleanor, Duchess of Gloucester, 213, 214.
- Cochrane, Lord, 515.
- Coke, Sir Edward, Chief Justice, 348, 349.
- Colchester, 374.
- Colet, John, 264.
- Coleridge, Samuel Taylor, 560.
- Colman, Bishop, 34.
- Colombières, treaty at, 103.
- Colonization, English, 327, 337; in Ireland, 336; in New England, 351, 358, 398; elsewhere see BRITISH DOMINIONS, GROWTH OF.
- Columba, Saint, 34.
- Columbus, Christopher, 202, 239.
- Commerce. See TRADE.
- Common Prayer. See BOOK OF COMMON PRAYER.
- Commons, House of. See PARLIAMENT.
- Concord, town, 470.
- Conformity Bill, Occasional, 440.
- Congress, Continental, 469, 470.
- Connaught, King of, 102.
- Connaught, 382.
- Conservative party, 529, 538, 540, 544.
- Constable, John, painter, 560.
- Constance, Council of, 201.
- Constantine, 18, 25.
- Constantinople, 18, 30, 39, 54, 170, 201, 264.
- Continental system, Napoleon's, 504, 506.
- Conventicles Act, 409.
- Convicts, 483, 552, 570.
- Conway, treaty of, 122.
- Cook, Captain James, 493, 494, 570.
- Cooper, Anthony Ashley. See SHAFTESBURY, EARL OF.
- Cope, General, 450.
- Copenhagen, 501; battle of, 504.
- Copernicus, astronomer, 266.
- Coping, separatist, 317.
- Cork, 102.
- Corn Laws, 526-527.
- Cornwall, 11, 28, 32; earldom of, 172; 292, 313, 460.
- Cornwallis, Charles, first Marquis, 471.
- Corporation Act, 408.
- Cortez, 266.
- Coster, printer, 265.
- Cotton industry, 480.
- Council, orders in, to meet Continental system, 503, 504, 506.
- County Courts, 101, 143, 151.

- Courtenay, Henry, Marquis of Exeter, 289.
 Covenant National, 361, 384.
 Covenant, Solemn League and, 371.
 Covenanters, 429, 431.
 Coventry, Parliament at, 219, 245.
 Coverdale, Miles, 285.
 Cowper, William, 492.
 Cowper, Earl, 543.
 Cranfield, Lionel, Earl of Middlesex, 347, 351.
 Cranmer, Thomas, Archbishop of Canterbury, 275, 282, 286, 290, 294, 297.
 Crécy, battle of, 177-178, 179, 183, 215.
 Crete, 531.
 Crimean War, 513, 531-534, 536, 546, 581.
 Cromwell, Frances, 391, 392.
 Cromwell, Oliver, 368-402; in Civil War, 368-373; in Ireland, 380-383; in Scotland, 385-386; expels Long Parliament, 388-389; summons Nominated Parliament, 389; Protector, 390; character, 391-392; wars with Holland, 395; with Spain, 396; foreign policy, 396-397; colonial policy, 397; domestic policy, 398-399; taxation of, 400; death, 400; 406, 410, 429, 434.
 Cromwell, Richard, Protector, 401, 402.
 Cromwell, Thomas, Earl of Essex, 279-282; beheaded, 286.
 Crusading movement, 77, 86, 108, 120, 122, 234.
 Cuba, 396, 454.
 Culloden Moor, battle of, 450, 451.
 Cumberland, William Augustus, Duke of, 450.
 Cumberland, 10.
 Curfew, 146.
 Cyprus, 536.
 Dacre, Lord, 304.
 Dampier, William, navigator, 570.
 Danby, Earl of. See OSBORNE, THOMAS.
 Danegeld, 44.
 Danelaw, 41, 43.
 Danes, 12, 40; in England, 41; accept Christianity, 42; checked, 42; conquest and rule of England, 44-46.
 Dante, 106.
 Danube, 26, 438.
 Darien, Scottish colony at, 439.
 Darnley, Henry, Lord, 303, 304.
 Darwin, Charles, 556-557.
 David, Welsh Prince, 122.
 Davis, John, 326.
 Davison, William, secretary to Elizabeth, 309, 311.
 Davitt, Michael, 543.
 Declaratory Act, 466.
 Defoe, Daniel, 491.
 Deira, division of England, 30, 39.
 Delhi, 576, 581.
 Denmark, 27, 44, 45, 501, 513.
 Deorham, battle of, 28, 74.
 Derby, Edward Stanley, fourteenth Earl of, 537.
 Dermot, Irish chieftain, 102.
 Derwentwater, James Radcliffe, third Earl of, 443.
 Descartes, 337.
 Dispenser, Hugh le, 173.
 Dispenser, Hugh le (the younger), 173.
 Dettingen, battle of, 450.
 Devereux, Robert. See ESSEX, EARL OF.
 Devon, 11, 18, 292.
 De Witt, Dutch Admiral, 413.
 Dickens, Charles, 561.
 Digby, Sir Evelyn, 345.
 Dillon, John, 543.
 Disease, in thirteenth century, 160, 174, 179, 255; in fifteenth century, 262-263; in sixteenth century, 334; 493; in Ireland, 541. Black death, 64, 179, 183, 185, 188, 263, 338; cholera, 557; king's evil, 437; leprosy, 262, 263;

- plague, 411, 413; prison fever, 484, 488; smallpox, 493; sweating sickness, 263.
- Disraeli, Benjamin. See BEA-CONSFIELD, EARL OF.
- Dive, Norman seaport, 53, 55.
- Domesday Book, 80, 81, 104.
- Dominic, St., founds mendicant order, 106, 135, 255.
- Douay University, 306.
- Dover, Straits of, 21, 49, 60, 208, 214.
- Dover, treaty of, 414, 415.
- Downs, the, 219.
- Drake, Sir Francis, 313, 314, **318-319**, 326, 397.
- Dress, 18, 19, 25, 65; pre-Norman, **67, 68**, 150; thirteenth century, **161-162**, 184, 187, 243; fifteenth century, **260**; Irish, 287, 300, 321; sixteenth century, **333-334**; eighteenth century, **494**.
- Drogheda, massacre of, 381.
- Druidism, 20, 22.
- Dryden, John, 490-491.
- Dublin, 102, 235, 287, 288, 381, 431, 509, 510, 544.
- Duddingston, Lieutenant, 467.
- Dudley, John, Lord Lisle, Earl of Warwick and Duke of Northumberland, 291-295; executed, 296, 297.
- Dudley, Lord Guildford, 294; executed, 296.
- Dudley, Robert, Earl of Leicester, 307, 332.
- Dudley, Sir Edmund, lawyer, 237; executed, 267.
- Dudley, family of, 282.
- Duelling, 487, 561, 562.
- Dumbarton, 33.
- Dunbar, 369, 385; battle of, 401.
- Duncan, Adam, first viscount Camperdown, 501.
- Dundee, Viscount. See GRAHAM, JOHN.
- Dungeness, 387.
- Dunkirk, 397.
- Dunstan, Abbot, 36, 43.
- Dupleix, Governor of Pondicherry, 578.
- Duquesne, Fort, 451.
- Durham, 4; Cathedral, 151, 153; 178, 221, 304, 363, 398.
- Durham, John George Lambton, Earl of, 567.
- Dutch. See HOLLAND.
- Dwelling-houses, 29, 63, 64, 67, 68, 158, 258, 330.
- East India Company, 326, 327, 468, 534, **577-581**; Dutch, 326, 577; French, 578, 581.
- Edgar Atheling, 60, 78.
- Edgar, King, 42, 44.
- Edgecote, battle of, 224.
- Edgehill, battle of, 368.
- Edinburgh, 203, 292, 339, 362, 384, 385, 443, 450, 514.
- Edinburgh, treaty of, 301, 339.
- Edith, Godwin's daughter, wife of Edward the Confessor, 48.
- Edith, wife of Harold, 52.
- Edith Swanneschals, 52.
- Edmund Ironsides, 44, 60.
- Edmund, King, 42.
- Edmund, son of Henry III, 117.
- Edred, King, 42.
- Education, in the hands of priests, 20, 35, 36, 43, 69; encouraged by Alfred, 42, 89; aided by guilds, 149; in thirteenth century, **165-168**; 298, 398; in eighteenth century, **492-493**; advances in nineteenth century, **558-559**. See also LANGUAGE, MEDICINE, SCIENCE, UNIVERSITIES.
- Edward, King, 42.
- Edward the Confessor, **45-49**, 74, 78, 87.
- Edward the Elder, 42.
- Edward I, 106, **120-130**, 149, 159, 160, 161, 163, 170, 172, 175, 242, 251, 337, 399, 540.
- Edward II, **171-174**, 194.
- Edward III, 173, **174-186**, 220, 242, 298.
- Edward IV, 210, **220-228**, 229, 230, 232, 234, 235.
- Edward V, 229-231.

- Edward VI, 271, 286, 287, **289-294**, 295, 302, 327.
 Edward VII, 546.
 Edward, Prince of Wales (Black Prince), **179-182**, 185, 186.
 Edward, son of Henry VI, 219, 224, 225, 226.
 Edwin, English earl, 52, 56, 77.
 Edwy, King, 42, 43.
 Egbert, King, 40, 74.
 Egypt, 501, 513, 531, 535, 576, 580.
 Elba, 506, 507.
 Eleanor, of Aquitaine, queen of Henry II, 93, 103, 109, 118.
 Eleanor, of Castile, queen of Edward I, 128, 129, 159.
 Eleanor, of Provence, queen of Henry III, 116, 117.
 Eleanor, wife of Simon de Montfort, 118.
 Electric telegraph, 548, 549, 550.
 Elementary Education Bill, 559.
 Eliot, Sir John, 353, 356.
 Elizabeth (Queen), 285, 288, 292, 293, 296, 297; reign, **299-321**, 324-327, 332-334, 339, 343, 346, 347, 353, 369, 380, 436.
 Elizabeth, queen of Edward IV. See **WOODVILLE, ELIZABETH**.
 Elizabeth, of York, queen of Henry VII, 228, 232, 235.
 Elizabeth, daughter of James I, 349.
 Ely, 78, 79, 398.
 Emma or Elgiva, 45, 46.
 Empson, Sir Richard, 237; executed, 267.
 Encumbered Estates Act, 541.
 English Channel, 387.
 English Company, 575, 577, 578.
 English Revolution, 424, 425; terms of, 428, 431, 439, 440.
 Epworth, 486.
 Erasmus, 201, 264, 266, 325.
 Eric, King of Norway, 123.
 Erpingham, North, Hundred of, 145.
 Essex, Robert Devereux, second Earl of, 320, 321.
 Essex, Robert Devereux, third Earl of, 369.
 Essex, Arthur Capel, Earl of, 418.
 Establishment of King's succession, Act for, 276.
 Estates, Scottish. See **PARLIAMENT, SCOTTISH**.
 Ethelbert, King, 32, 70.
 Ethelred, the Unready, 44-46.
 Eton College, 210, 559.
 Eugene, Prince of Savoy, 438.
 Eustace of Boulogne, 49.
 Eustace, son of Stephen, 91.
 Evangelical Movement, 552, 553.
 Evesham, battle of, 120.
 Exchequer, Barons of the, 89.
 Excise Bill, 448.
 Exeter, 77.
 Exhibition, Great, of 1851, 512.
 Explanation, Act of, 383.
 Factory Act, 521.
 Fairfax, Ferdinando, second Baron, 368.
 Fairfax, Sir Thomas, afterward Lord, 368, 369, 374, 385, 395, 402.
 Falaise, Castle of, 50.
 Falkes de Breauté, 116.
 Falkirk, battle of, 121, 129.
 Farmer, Anthony, 422.
 Fashoda incident, the, 536, 537.
 Fastolfe, Sir John, 244.
 Fawkes, Guy, conspirator, 344, 345.
 Felton, John, Assassin, 355.
 Fenian movement, 541.
 Ferdinand, King of Aragon, 202.
 Feudalism, 39, 43, 74, 84, 86, 104, 106, 111, 126, **136-137**, 176, 178. See also **BARONAGE**.
 "Field of the Cloth of Gold," 269, 333.
 Fielding, Henry, 491.
 "Fifth Monarchy," 392, 393.
 Finance, 238, 298, 300, 347, 444.
 Finch, Sir John, 356.
 Fire of London, 411-413, 492.

- Fisher, John, Bishop of Rochester, 277, 278.
 Fitzgerald, Lord Edward, 509.
 Five-Mile Act, 409.
 Flanders, 177, 238, 270, 279,
 Fleetwood, Charles, General, 402.
 Flodden Field, battle of, 268, 338.
 Florida, 454.
 "Folk-Moot," 72.
 Fontenoy, battle of, 450.
 Fontevrault, 104, 109.
 Food, 65, 66, 160, 184, 261, 328, 334, 494.
 Fornham, battle of, 102.
 Forster, Thomas, rebel, 443.
 Forster, William E., 543, 559.
 Fotheringay Castle, 308, 309, 310.
 Fowin, groom of Edward I, 122.
 Fox, Charles James, 472, 473, 494, 499, 500, 502, 503, 504.
 Fox, George, Quaker, 399.
 Fox, Richard, Bishop of Durham and Winchester, 238.
 France, 30; joins Scotland against Edward I, 128; Edward III's war upon, 175-178, 179; gives up Aquitaine, 181; 188, 202, 207; renewed attempt to conquer, 209-216; 223, 226, 227, 228, 233, 238, 275, 286, 288, 292, 295, 298, 301, 303, 305, 313, 327, 338, 363, 373, 379, 381, 385, 386, 391, 395, 397, 405; Charles II's subservience to, 413-416, 425, 427; William III's wars with, 428-436; Anne's war with, 438-439; 441, 443, 444; renewed war with, under George II, 450-451; the Seven Years' War with, 451-455; 457, 461, 462; aids revolted colonies, 470-472; 477; 497; a republic, 497; 498; Britain's war upon Republic and Napoleon, 499-507, 512, 513, 530; joins Britain in Crimean War, 531-534; 536, 537, 566, 580.
 Franchise, 475, 519, 537, 540, 546, 575.
 Franchise Bill, 539-540.
 Francis, St., of Assisi, founds mendicant order, 106, 135; Franciscans, 255.
 Francis I, of France, 269.
 Francis II, of France, 302, 303.
 Franco-German War, 513.
 "Frank pledge," 146.
 Franks, 18, 31.
 Franklin, Benjamin, 461, 466, 468, 472.
 Frederick II, Emperor, 106, 117.
 Frederick II (the Great), King of Prussia, 427, 450-455, 457.
 Frederick William I, King of Prussia, 446, 493.
 Frederick, Elector-Palatine, 349-351.
 Free Church of Scotland, 554, 555.
 Free Trade, Walpole promotes, 448; established, 527.
 French Revolution, 473, 495, 497-507, 509.
 Frobisher, Martin, 326.
 Froissart, 175, 193.
 Fulford, 56.
 Furniture, 68, 159, 258, 330.
 Gage, General, 469, 470.
 Gainsborough, Thomas, painter, 492.
 Gama, Vasco da, 202, 240.
 Gardiner, Stephen, Bishop of Winchester, 290, 296.
 Garibaldi, Italian patriot, 512.
 Gascony, 116, 118, 172, 238.
 Gaspee, the, 467.
 Gaul, 20, 21, 26, 27, 33.
 Gaveston, Piers, 171-173.
 Geneva, 266, 358.
 Geoffrey of Anjou, 89, 92.
 Geoffrey, son of Henry II, 103, 110.
 Geography of British Isles, 1-6.
 Geological Survey, 557.
 George I, 442-445; death, 446; 458.
 George II, reign, 446-453; 458, 485, 493.

- George III ends Seven Years' War, **453-455**; political aims and methods, **457-460**; conflict with American colonies under, **463-473**, 475, 479, 486, 495; war with France under, **499-507**; insanity, 502, 503, 504, 510; death, 515; 517, 524.
- George IV, reign, 515-518.
- George, Prince of Denmark, 439.
- Gerberoi, battle of, 82.
- Germany, 36, 39, 235, 427, 452, 503, 512, 513, 558, 585.
- Ghent, Peace of, 506.
- Gibbon, Edward, 492, 561.
- Gibraltar, 397, 438, 441, 444, 471; siege, 471; 502, 565, 583.
- Gilbert, Sir Humphrey, 327.
- Gladstone, William Ewart, 526, 531, 537, **538-545**, 551, 555, 556.
- Glencoe, Massacre of, 431.
- Glendower, Owen, 203, 204.
- Gloucester Cathedral, 258.
- Gloucester, Humphrey, Duke of, 211, 213, 214.
- Gloucester, Richard, Duke of, 227, 228-230; proclaimed king, 231. See **RICHARD III**.
- Gloucester, statute of, 125.
- Goderich, Frederick John Robinson, Viscount, and Earl of Ripon, 516.
- Godfrey, Sir Edmund Berry, 416.
- Godolphin, Sydney, Lord, 438.
- Godwin, house of, 48; influence of, 49.
- Goldsmith, Oliver, 492.
- Gordon, Charles George, General, 535.
- Gordon, Lady Catherine, 235.
- Gordon, Lord George, 462.
- Gordon Riots, 462, 485.
- Goths, 18, 26, 27, 30.
- Gower, John, 265.
- Grafton, Duke of, 458, 466.
- Grafton Regis, 223.
- Graham, John, of Claverhouse, Viscount Dundee, 430.
- Granville, Earl. See **CARTERET, JOHN**.
- Gratian's digest of Canon Law, 94.
- Grattan, Henry, 508, 509.
- Gray, Thomas, 492.
- Greece, 54, 512, 530.
- Greek Church, 532.
- Greenstead, Essex, church at, 47.
- Greenwood, John, separatist, 317.
- Gregorian reckoning of time, 451.
- Gregory I (the Great), Pope, 30; his mission to England, 31, 32.
- Gregory VII, Pope (Hildebrand), 52, 76, 80, 94, 98.
- Grenada, 202.
- Grenville, Sir Richard, 326.
- Grenville, Lord George, 458, 464, 465.
- Grey, Charles, Earl, **518-520**, 532.
- Grey, John de, Bishop of Norwich, 112.
- Grey, Lady Jane, **294-296**, 325.
- Grey, Lord Richard, 231.
- Grey, Sir John, 223.
- Grey, Sir Thomas, executed, 296.
- Grice, John, 245.
- Grindal, Edmund, Archbishop of Canterbury, 316.
- Grocyn, William, 264.
- Grossetête, Robert, Bishop of Lincoln, 116.
- Guadeloupe, 454, 455.
- Guiana, 507.
- Guilds, 148, 149, 187, 253, 254, 291, 327.
- Guinea Company, 327.
- Guiscard, Robert, 51.
- Guises, the, 311.
- Gulf stream, 3.
- Gunpowder, invention of, 170.
- Gunpowder Plot, 344-346.
- Gutenberg, printer, 265.
- Gyrth, brother of King Harold, 59.

- Habeas Corpus Act passed, 417; suspended, 500, 514.
 Haddon Hall, 331.
 Hadrian, Emperor, 23, 25.
 Halidon Hill, battle of, 175, 178.
 Halifax, Charles Montague, Earl of, 436.
 Halifax, George Saville, Marquis of, 421.
 Hamilton, James, Duke of, 374, 375.
 Hamilton, Patrick, 338.
 Hampden, John, 362, 365, 366; killed, 368.
 Hampton Court Conference, 342, 400.
 Hanover, house of, 439, 442.
 Harcourt, Sir Robert, 245.
 Hardicanute, King, 45.
 Harfleur, 207.
 Harley, Robert, Earl of Oxford, 440-444.
 Harold, Danish king, 45.
 Harold, Earl of Wessex becomes king, 49; reign, **51-59**, 78.
 Harold Hardrada, 54-57.
 Harrison, Thomas, General, 388, 392.
 Harvey, William, 387.
 Hastings, battle of, 49, **58-59**, 88, 176.
 Hastings, Warren, first Governor-General of India, 495, 580.
 Hatton, Sir Christopher, 333.
 Havana, 454.
 Havelock, Sir Henry, 581.
 Hawkins, John, 313; begins English slave-trade, 318.
 Hengist, 27.
 Henrietta Maria, queen of Charles I, 352, 353, 363, 370.
 Henry I, 87-89.
 Henry II, **92-104**, 166, 299, 540.
 Henry III, **115-120**, 169, 183.
 Henry IV, 195, 196, 197, **202-204**, 205, 206, 209, 225, 289.
 Henry V, **204-208**, 210, 211; designs of, 216.
 Henry VI, **209-226**, 245.
 Henry VII (see also RICHMOND, EARL OF), 169, 201, 228, **233-239**, 243, 249, 251; conditions under, 263, 264, 287, 324, 329, 338.
 Henry VIII, 186, 222, 242; reign, **267-289**; quarrel with Church, **272-285**; marriages, 285-286; death, 289; 295, 297, 298, 324, 329, 333, 338, 340, 353, 437, 458.
 Henry V, Emperor, 89.
 Henry VI, Emperor, 108.
 Henry IV, of France, 336, 341, 353.
 Henry, Bishop of Winchester, 90.
 Henry, son of Henry II, 103.
 Henry of Derby. See HENRY IV.
 Henry, son of James I, 349.
 Heptarchy, 39.
 Herbert family, 282.
 Hereford, Earl of, 128.
 Hereward, the Wake, 78, 104.
 Hertford, Council of, 35.
 Hertford, Earl of. See SEYMOUR, EDWARD.
 Hexham, battle near, 223.
 High Commission, Court of, established, 317; abolished, 365.
 Hildebrand. See GREGORY VII.
 Hill, Sir Rowland, 550, 551.
 Hogarth, William, painter, 492.
 Holbeach, 345.
 Holbein, Hans, painter, 329.
 Holland, 225, 300, 311, 313; precedes England in India, **326**; 336, 351, 363; commonwealth's wars with, **386-387**, **395**, 397; Charles II's war with and seizure of New York, **411**; 414, 415, 417, 418, 424, 427; ruler becomes King of England, 428; 433, 470, 471, 477, 501, 507; efforts in South Seas, 569; in South Africa, 574; in India, 577, 580.
 Holland, New, 570.
 Holmby, 372.
 Holy Alliance, the, 512.
 Holy Land, 77, 122, 234.
 Holy Roman Empire, 45, 503.

- Home Rule Question. See IRELAND.
- Homildon Hill, battle of, 203.
- Hooker, Richard, 325.
- Hooper, John, Bishop of Gloucester, 297.
- Hopton, Sir Ralph, 368.
- Horsa, 27.
- Hounslow Heath, 421.
- Howard, Catherine, wife of Henry VIII, 286.
- Howard, Charles, Lord, of Effingham, Earl of Nottingham, 313, 315.
- Howard, Catherine, wife of Henry VIII, 286.
- Howard, William, Viscount Stafford, 416.
- Howe, Lord, 501.
- Hubert de Burgh, 116.
- Hubertsburg, Peace of, 455.
- Huddleston, Father, 419.
- Hudson's Bay, 441.
- Hugh de Lacy, 102.
- Huguenots, 305, 355, 574.
- Humber, 7, 25, 55.
- "Humble Petition and Advice," 394, 395.
- Hume, David, 492.
- Humour, mediæval, 165.
- Humphrey, Duke of Gloucester, Protector, 211, 213, 214.
- Hundred, 71; court, 71; 143.
- Hundred Years' War, end of, 216.
- Hudson, Lord, 304.
- Hungary, 512.
- Hunt, Holman, painter, 560.
- Hurst Castle, 375.
- Hurstmonceaux, Sussex, 257.
- Huss, John, reformer, 170, 206.
- Hutchinson, Thomas, Chief Justice of Massachusetts, 465, 468, 469.
- Hyde, Edward, Earl of Clarendon, 407-411; fall, 413.
- Hyder Ali, 580.
- Iceni, 22.
- Iffley church, 152, 153.
- Indemnity, Act of, 410.
- Independence, Declaration of, 470, 471.
- Independents, religious party, 371, 385, 389, 398, 409, 433.
- India, 202, 216, 240, 326, 336, 450, 452, 453, 454, 455, 459, 495, 501, 507, 530, 531, 535, 565, 574, 576-582.
- Indian Mutiny, 513, 534, 535, 581.
- Indulgence, declaration of, by Charles II, 408, 415; by James II, 422, 423.
- Industrial revolution, 480, 481.
- Industries, 5, 6, 62; in mediæval village, 142; thirteenth century, 162; fourteenth century, 184; 238; growth of in fifteenth century, 251; growth of under Elizabeth, 327; 475; inventions, 479-480; cotton, 480; Canadian, 569; Australian, 571; silk weaving, 480; wool trade, 150, 238, 250, 257, 327, 328, 477, 480.
- Ine, King of Wessex, 70, 74.
- Inkermann, battle of, 533.
- Innocent III, Pope, 112.
- Innocent X, Pope, 380.
- Innocent XI, Pope, 442.
- Instrument of government, 390, 393.
- Inns, licensing monopoly in, 348.
- Investitures, 76, 88; wars of the, 88.
- Iona, 34.
- Ipswich, 268, 271, 274.
- Ireland, 5, 14; accepts Christianity, 33; English conquest, 102, 103; 196, 216, 219; Poyning's Act, 287; Henry VIII's policy toward, 287; 314; revolt in, 320-321; 336; Straf-ford in, 360; massacre in, 365; 372; Cromwell in, 380-382; Protestant settlement of, 382-383; 386, 400, 421, 428; Revolution in, 431; William III in, 431-432; 435, 464, 502; conditions of, in eighteenth century, 507-508; rebellion in, 509; union with Great Britain, 509-510; 518, 522, 527,

- 539; famine and disease, **540-542**; church question, **542**; Home Rule question, **540-545**; 555.
- Ireton, Henry, 374, 375.
- Irish Church, disestablished, 542.
- Irwell, river, 476.
- Isabella, wife of Edward II, 173; destroys the Despensers, 173; 174, 175.
- Isabella, of France, wife of Richard II, 195.
- Isabella, Queen of Castile, 202.
- Islam, faith of, 30, 583.
- Italy, 26, 27, 39, 161, 201, 202, 245, 266, 275, 279, 503, 512, 525, 532.
- "Jack Straw," rebel, 191, 193.
- Jacquerie in France, 181.
- Jacobite rising, first, 443; second, 450.
- Jamaica, 396, 397, 398.
- James IV, of Scotland, 235; killed at Flodden, 268; 338.
- James V, of Scotland, 239, 338.
- James VI, of Scotland, 311, 338, 339, 340. See JAMES I, OF ENGLAND.
- James I, of England, 317, 334, 336; reign, **340-351**; colonization under, 351; 354, 357, 380.
- James II, of England, 408, 411; reign, **419-425**; 429, 430; in Ireland, **431-432**; final defeat, 432; 436, 450, 507. See JAMES, DUKE OF YORK.
- James, Duke of York, 415, **416-418**. See JAMES II.
- James Edward (Old Pretender), 423, 425, 436, 438, 439, **441-443**.
- Jameson Raid, 536.
- Jansenists, 379.
- Jarrow, 35, 36, 65.
- Jeffreys, George, Baron, 420 422.
- Jena, battle of, 503.
- Jenkins, Captain, 449.
- Jerome, of Prague, reformer, 170.
- Jerusalem, 30, 107, 130.
- Jervis, John, Earl of St. Vincent, 501.
- Jesuits, 306, 379, 415, 416, 422, 427, 457.
- Jews, massacred, 107; expulsion of, 126, 127; 150, 399, 556.
- Joan of Arc, 209-213.
- Joanna of Castile, 234.
- John, 103, 107, 108; King, **109-115**; 153, 185, 540.
- John, King of France, 180-182.
- John, Duke of Bedford, 211, 213.
- John of Gaunt, Duke of Lancaster, 182, 183, 185-187, 189, 191, 194, 195, 213.
- Johnson, Dr. Samuel, 486, 491.
- Jonson, Ben, 325.
- Joseph II, of Austria, 457.
- Joyce, Cornet George, 371.
- Judicature Act, 552.
- "Junius," 461.
- Junto, the, 434.
- Justice, High Court of, to try Charles I, 375.
- Justinian, 18, 70, 94.
- Jutes, 27, 31, 32.
- Jutland, 27.
- Kabul, 582.
- Kaffirs, 575.
- Katharine, daughter of Charles VI, of France, 208.
- Kay, John, 480.
- Keats, John, 560.
- Keble, John, 553.
- Kenilworth, dictum of, 120.
- Kent, Thomas, Earl of, 202.
- Kent, settled by Jutes, 27; 31, 32, 74, 190, 206, 215, 224, 374.
- Kent, Earl of, at execution of Mary Stuart, 309.
- Kepler, astronomer, 337.
- Keppel, Arnold Joost van, Earl of Albemarle, 436.
- Ket, Robert, rebel, 292.
- Khartoum, 535.
- Kilkenny, statute of, 287.
- Killiecrankie, battle of, 430.
- Kilmainham Jail, 543.
- King's Evil, 437.
- King's Langley, 205.

- Kitchener, Herbert, Lord, 535, 575.
 Kneller, Sir Godfrey, 492.
 Knights, Templars, 137; Hospitallers, 137; Teutonic, 137; knighthood, **137-138**, 177, 207; knighthood in fifteenth century, **243-244**.
 Knox, John, 339, 340.
 Kossuth, Louis, 512.
 Kruger, Paul, 536.
 Labourers, statutes of, 188.
 Lagos, battle of, 453.
 La Hogue, battle of, 432.
 Laing's Neck, battle at, 575.
 Lambert, John, General, 390, 402, 403, 406.
 Lancaster, Thomas, Earl of, 201, 218.
 Land Act, Ireland, 542, 543, 544, 545.
 Landen, battle of, 434.
 Lanfranc, Archbishop of Canterbury, 78, 80, 84.
 Langton, Stephen, Archbishop of Canterbury, 112-114.
 Language, 25, 93, 169, 183, 184, 191, 198, 232, 324, 325; English, 16, 17, 70, 120, **168**, 234, **264-265**, 301, **325**, 442, 444, 481, 489; French, 47, 168, 293, 299, 481; Greek, 168, 264, 293, 299, 324, 325; Latin, 70, 168, 264, 290, 293, 299, 301, 444, 481, 489; Irish, 287; Italian, 293, 299; Hebrew, 299.
 Lansdowne, battle of, 368.
 Latimer, Lord, 286.
 Latimer, Hugh, Bishop of Worcester, 264, 297.
 Laud, William, Archbishop of Canterbury, policy, **356-358**; 360, 361, 363, 365; beheaded, 371; 407.
 Law, John, 494.
 Law, 1, 12, 41, 42, 71, 72, 77; early English, 70; church's system, 80, **94**; canon, 94, 101, 104; Magna Charta, **113-114**; reformed, 124, 125, 126; criminal, **143-145**; 151, 232, 236, 286, 287; reformed by Cromwell, 398; state of criminal in eighteenth century, **481-483**; improved in nineteenth century, **551-552**.
 Lawrence, Sir Henry, 581.
 Lawrence, Sir Thomas, painter, 492.
 Leeds, 519.
 Leibnitz, 379.
 Leicester, 118, 232; Abbey, 273.
 Leicester, Earl of. See DUDLEY, ROBERT.
 Leighton, Dr. Alexander, 358.
 Leith, 292.
 Lely, Sir Peter, painter, 492.
 Lenthall, William, 402.
 Leofwine, brother of King Harold, 59.
 Leonardo da Vinci, 201.
 Leopold, Duke of Austria, 108.
 Leprosy. See DISEASE.
 "Les Espagnols sur Mer," battle, 179.
 Leslie, Alexander, Earl of Leven, 361, 370.
 Leslie, David, 369, 370, 385.
 Levant Company, 327.
 "Levellers, the," 393.
 Lewes, 120; Abbey of, 282.
 Lexington, battle of, 470.
 Liberal Party, 530, 540, 542, 545.
 Liberal Unionist Party, 544.
 Lichfield Cathedral, 155, 387.
 Lichfield, 436.
 Lilburne, John, leveller, 393.
 Limerick, pacification of, 432.
 Limerick, 102.
 Linaere, Thomas, 264.
 Lincoln, 91.
 Lincolnshire, 225.
 Lindisfarne, 34.
 Lisle, Lord. See DUDLEY, JOHN.
 Lister, Lord, 558.
 Literature in England; pre-Norman, **69-70**; 77, 88, 106, 115; in thirteenth century, **168-169**; 198, 201, 222, 239, 258; in fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, **264-266**;

- 278; in sixteenth century, 324, 336; 351, 447; in seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, 489-492; in nineteenth century, 560-561.
- Liverpool, Charles Jenkinson, Earl of, 504, 505.
- Lizard, the, 313.
- Llewellyn, of Wales, 122.
- Loire, 181, 208.
- Lollards, 190, 195, 202, 205, 206, 338.
- London, 23, 25, 26, 45, 47, 60, 115, 116, 148, 170, 184, 208, 217, 220, 224, 226, 235, 264, 326, 354, 366, 367, 373, 389, 392, 398, 402, 405, 406, 411; Plague, 411; Fire, 411-412, 416; Tower of, 79, 86, 148, 191, 193, 224, 226, 230, 277, 290, 311, 356, 396, 416, 417, 443, 461.
- Londonderry, 381, 431.
- Londonderry, Marquis of. See STEWART, ROBERT.
- Long-barrow culture, 9, 10.
- Longchamps, William, Chancellor, 109.
- Longland, William, 198, 265.
- Lords, House of. See PARLIAMENT.
- "Lords Ordainers," 172.
- Lothian, 337.
- Louis IX, of France, 106, 117, 119, 120.
- Louis XI, of France, intrigues with Warwick, 223; 226, 228.
- Louis XIV, of France, 405, 410; Charles II's alliance with, 414; 415; 422, 427, 432, 435, 436, 437, 439, 443.
- Louis XVI, of France, 457, 497.
- Louis Philippe, of France, 512.
- Louis, son of Philip IV, of France, 114, 115.
- Louisbourg, 450, 453.
- Louisiana, 454.
- Lowe, Robert, 559.
- Lowestoft, 411.
- Loyola, Ignatius, 266.
- Lucknow, siege of, 534, 581.
- Luddites, 513.
- Ludlow, 393.
- Luther, Martin, 170; work of, 266, 271, 279, 343, 488.
- Luttrell, Colonel, 462.
- Luxembourg, Marshal, 434.
- Lydgate, John, 265.
- Lyme, 420.
- Lynn, 225.
- Maczulay, Lord, 561.
- Macaulay, Zachary, 487.
- Macdonald, Alaster, 370.
- Macdonald, Sir John Alexander, 568, 569.
- Macdonald, clan, 431.
- Machiavelli, 279.
- Machinery, of eighteenth century, 480.
- Madras, 575, 578, 581.
- Madrid, 350, 438.
- Magellan, mariner, 266; Straits of, 319.
- Magna Charta, 113, 114, 124.
- Magnus Intercursus, 238.
- Magus Muir, 430.
- Mahdi, the, 535.
- Maine (in France), 51, 111, 214.
- Majuba Hill, 578.
- Malcolm II, King of Scotland, 337; III (Canmore), 78.
- Malory, Sir Thomas, 264.
- Malplaquet, battle of, 438.
- Malta, 507, 565.
- Manchester, Henry Montagu, Earl of, 347.
- Manchester, Edward Montagu, second Earl of, general, 369.
- Manhattan, 397.
- Manners, 28; table, in thirteenth century, 164; in fifteenth century, 261-262; of eighteenth century, 486-487; 495; of nineteenth century, 561-562.
- Manorial system, 138-140; manor, 63, 158, 159; decline of, 243, 250; 477.
- Mansfield, Lord, 463.
- Mantes, 82, 83.
- Maoris, the, 574.
- Mar, John Erskine, eleventh Earl of, 443.

- March, Earl of. See MORTIMER, EDMUND.
 Marco Polo, 170.
 Maria Theresa, 450.
 Marie Antoinette, 497.
 Margaret, St., queen of Malcolm III, of Scotland, 78, 87.
 Margaret, of Norway, 123.
 Margaret, wife of James IV, of Scotland, and daughter of Henry VII, 239, 293, 338.
 Margaret of Anjou, queen of Henry VI, 214, 217, **219-226**.
 Margaret, mother of Henry VII, 234.
 Margaret, Dowager Duchess of Burgundy, 235.
 Margaret, Countess of Salisbury, 289.
 Marlborough school, 559.
 Marlborough, statute of, 120.
 Marlborough, Duke of. See CHURCHILL, JOHN.
 Marlowe, Christopher, 325.
 "Mar-prelate" tracts, 316.
 Marshall, William, Earl of Pembroke, 114, 118.
 Marston Moor, battle of, 369.
 Martin, Master, Papal agent, 116.
 Martin, duellist, 461.
 Mary I (Queen), 272, 288, 293, 294; reign, **295-299**; 300-302, 320, 346, 419.
 Mary II, 423, 424, 428, 430, 432, 436.
 Mary Stuart, Queen of Scots, 286, 287, 292; marries Dauphin, 292, 293, 303; rule in Scotland, **303-304**; captivity, 304; trial and execution, **308-311**; 320, 338, 339, 341, 360.
 Mary, sister of Henry VIII, 293.
 Masham, Mrs., 440; afterward Lady, 440, 441.
 Mason, James M., 535.
 Masséna, Marshal, 505.
 Massachusetts Bay Colony, 358; Legislature of, 467-469.
 Matilda, queen of Henry I, 87.
 Matilda, daughter of Henry I and Empress, 89-92.
 Mauritius, 507.
 Mauron, battle of, 179.
 Maximilian, Emperor, 267.
 "May-flower," 351, 358.
 Mazarin, Cardinal, 336, 386.
 Mazzini, Italian patriot, 512.
 Meath, 3.
 Mecca, 583.
 Medicine in thirteenth century, 160-161; in fifteenth century, 263; in eighteenth century, 493; in nineteenth century, 557.
 Medici, Lorenzo de, 201.
 Medina Sidonia, Duke of, 313, 314.
 Mediterranean, 108, 326, 386, 387, 396, 507, 531, 532, 533.
 Medway, river, 413.
 Melbourne, William Lamb, Viscount, 522, 523, 525, 526, 551.
 Merchants, statute of, 126.
 Mercia, 32, 40, 45.
 Merovingian line, 30, 42.
 Methodism, 488-489, 491.
 Metternich, Prince, 512.
 Michael Angelo, 201, 266.
 Middlesex, Earl of. See CRANFIELD, LIONEL.
 Middlesex, 459, 461, 462.
 Milan decree of Napoleon, 504.
 Milbank Prison, 552.
 Milford Haven, 203, 232.
 Military and Naval Officers' Bill, 517.
 Millais, Sir J. E., painter, 560.
 Millenary petition, 342.
 Milton, John, 337, 367, 489, 490.
 Minorca, 438, 441, 452, 454, 471, 472.
 Mississippi, 451.
 Mitchell, John, 540.
 Moghuls, the Great, 576.
 Mohammed, 30.
 Mompesson, Sir Giles, 348.
 Mona, 22.
 Monasteries, 31, **33-36**; Benedictine rule, 43; 47, 65, 68, 132; in thirteenth century, **133-136**; 150, 151, 179, 187; in fifteenth century, **247-249**; 271, 274, 278, 279; dissolu-

- tion of, in sixteenth century, 278-284; Irish destroyed, 287, 328, 329.
- Monk, George, Duke of Albe-
marle, 402, 403, 404, 406.
- Monmouth, James Scott, Duke
of, 417, 419, 420, 430.
- Monroe Doctrine, 512, 583.
- Montagu, Charles, Earl of Hali-
fax, reforms coinage, 436.
- Montagu, Henry, Earl of Man-
chester, Lord High Treas-
urer, 347.
- Montaigne, 266.
- Monteagle, Lord, 345.
- Montfort, Simon de, 117, 120.
- Montrose, James Graham, Mar-
quis of, 370, 384.
- More, Hannah, 552.
- More, Sir Thomas, 264, 277, 278,
279.
- Morkere, English earl, 52, 56, 77.
- Mortimer, Edmund, Earl of
March, 203, 207.
- Mortimer, Roger, 173-175.
- Mortmain, statute of, 125, 195.
- Morton, John, Archbishop of
Canterbury, Cardinal, 237,
238, 250.
- Moscow, 326, 497.
- Mowbray, Thomas, Earl of Not-
tingham, 204.
- Murray, Lord James Stuart,
Earl of, Regent of Scotland,
339, 340.
- Music, 160, 203, 260, 267, 392,
447.
- Mysore, 580.
- Mystery Plays, 165, 168.
- Nantes, Edict of, 391; revoca-
tion of, 405.
- Napoleon Bonaparte, 395, 437,
450, 497; first consul, 497;
498, 501-507, 517, 530, 580.
- Napoleon III, 512, 522, 532.
- Naseby, battle of, 368, 369, 370.
- Natal, 575.
- National Debt, 435, 463, 513.
- National Land League, 543.
- Navarino, battle of, 530.
- Navigation Act, 387.
- Navy. See SEA-POWER.
- Necker, French Minister, 457,
497.
- Nelson, Horatio, Viscount, 397,
501, 502, 573.
- Neolithic culture, 9.
- Netherlands, 266, 303, 305,
307.
- Neville's Cross, battle of, 178.
- New Amsterdam, 411.
- New Brunswick, 397, 566, 568.
- New England, 319, 337, 351,
397, 450, 469, 566.
- New Forest, 84, 86.
- New France, 566.
- New Holland, 570.
- New learning, 324.
- "New Model Army," 369, 407.
- New Orleans, 506.
- New South Wales, 570, 572.
- New York, 397, 411, 465, 466,
469.
- New Zealand, 494, 565, 570,
574.
- Newcastle, 6, 23, 221.
- Newcastle, Thomas Pelham,
Duke of, 450, 452, 458.
- Newcastle, William Cavendish,
Earl of, 368.
- Newcomen, Thomas, inventor,
480.
- Newfoundland, 327, 441, 568.
- Newgate Prison, 462, 483.
- Newman, John Henry, 553.
- Newmarket, 372.
- Newspapers, 548-550.
- Newton, Sir Isaac, 379, 427.
- Nicolas I, Czar, 531-533.
- Nile, battle of the, 501.
- Ninian, St., 34.
- Nobles. See BARONAGE and
LORDS, HOUSE OF.
- Non-jurors, 434.
- Nore, the, 500, 501.
- Norfolk, 478.
- Norfolk, Earl of, 128.
- Norfolk, John Howard, first
Duke of, 244.
- Norfolk, Thomas Howard, third
Duke of, 273, 286, 289.
- Norfolk, Thomas Howard, fourth
Duke of, 304, 305.

- Nor'mandy, war in, 81, 84; won by Rufus, 86; relinquished by Henry I, 87; dependency of England, 88, 89, 93; lost by John, 111; 116, 177; under Henry V, 208; 214, 216, 232.
 Normans, 46, 56, 58, 59, 77, 152, 162.
 North, Council of the, 359.
 North, Frederick, Lord, afterwards Earl of Guildford, 458, 467, 472, 473.
 "North Briton, The," 460, 461.
 North Sea, 26, 27.
 Northampton, 98; Assize of, 101; 460.
 Northumberland, 77, 363.
 Northumberland, Duke of. See DUDLEY, JOHN.
 Northumberland, Henry Algonon Percy, Earl of, 274.
 Northumberland, Henry Percy, Earl of, 203-205.
 Northumberland, Thomas Percy, Earl of, 304.
 Northumbria, 34, 39, 40, 45, 74.
 Nottingham, 91, 102, 160, 225, 366; Castle, 157, 175.
 Norway, 44, 45, 54, 55, 123, 326.
 Norwich, 102.
 Nova Scotia, 397, 441, 472, 566, 568.
 Novgorod, fair, 150.
 Oates, Titus, 415, 416, 419.
 O'Brien, Smith, 540.
 Oecleve, Thomas, 265.
 Oceania, 565.
 O'Connell, Daniel, 517, 518, 540, 550.
 O'Connor, Feargus, 530.
 Odo, Archbishop of Canterbury, 37.
 Odo, Bishop of Bayeux, 81, 82, 84.
 Odoacer, 18.
 Offa, King of Mercia, 40, 74.
 Ogle, Sir Chaloner, 486.
 Ohio, 451.
 Oldecastle, Sir John, Lord Cobham, 206.
 Oliver, Andrew, 465, 468.
 Ontario, 568.
 Oporto, battle of, 505.
 Orange Free State, 546, 575.
 Orinoco, 350.
 Orleans, Duke of, 207, 211, 212, 213.
 Ormonde, James Butler, first Duke of, 380.
 Ormonde, James Butler, second Duke of, 441, 443.
 Osborne, Thomas, Earl of Danby, Duke of Leeds, 416, 417.
 Oswald, King, 34.
 Oswy, King, 34.
 Oudenarde, battle of, 438.
 Overbury, Sir Thomas, 347.
 Oxford, 120, 152, 367, 494.
 Oxford, Earl of. See HARLEY, ROBERT.
 Oxford Movement, 553.
 Oxford, Provisions of, 119.
 Oxford University. See UNIVERSITIES.
 Paget, Sir William, 289.
 Palæolithic culture, 8.
 Palestine, 532.
 Palmerston, Henry John Temple, Viscount, 524, 528, 529, 531-537.
 Panama, Isthmus of, 315, 396, 444, 449.
 Paris, 165-168, 177, 182, 438, 500, 506.
 Paris, Peace of (1763), 454.
 Paris, Peace of (1814), 507.
 Paris, Peace of (1856), 533.
 Parker, Matthew. Archbishop of Canterbury, 316.
 Parliament, beginning of, under Henry III, 119; Commons admitted to, 127-128; members from towns in, 147; controls trade, 149; French used in, 169; elections to, under Edward III, 183; the "Good," 185; Richard II and, 187; "Merciless," 194; authority of, under Henry IV, 204; surrenders authority to Henry VII, 237-238; under Henry VIII, 270, 275-276, 281; under Elizabeth, 319-320; dis-

- putes with James I, 347-349;
 quarrels with Charles I, 353;
 the "Long," 364; declares
 England a Republic, 379; de-
 cline of "Long," 388; nomi-
 nated, 389; dissolved, 391;
 Cromwell and, 393-395;
 "Rump," 402, 403; conven-
 tion, 409; under Charles II,
 408-417; makes William III
 king, 428; disputes with Wil-
 liam III, 435-436; of United
 Kingdom, 439; under Wal-
 pole, 446; under George III,
 459; reformed, 514-516; un-
 der Victoria diminishes au-
 thority of Crown, 524; Jews
 admitted to, 556; atheists
 admitted to, 556.
 Parliament, Irish, 382, 383, 431,
 508, 509; Grattan's, 509; abol-
 ished, 510.
 Parliament, Scottish, 338-340,
 350, 362, 373, 380, 384; abol-
 ished, 386.
 Parliament, House of Lords,
 128, 205, 232; members in,
 242; under Mary, 294; re-
 fuses to aid in trial of Charles
 I, 375; abolished by Long
 Parliament, 379; Cromwell's,
 395; Scottish peers in, 439;
 under Anne, 441; under Wal-
 pole, 447-448; Irish repre-
 sentative peers in, 510; 519;
 rejects Reform Bill, 518; 528,
 539, 552, 556.
 Parliament, House of Commons,
 first, 128; power of, 183; se-
 cures control of government,
 204-206; 215, 232, 309; sup-
 ports Bate, 346; James I dis-
 puts with, 348, 349; Charles
 I quarrels with, 353-356, 363,
 364, 366; 369, 372; "purged,"
 375, 388, 390; members ex-
 cluded from, 393; 395, 408,
 416, 434; Scotch members
 in, 439; 441, 446, 459, 460;
 expels Wilkes, 461; 462, 471,
 473, 494, 495; Irish members
 in, 510, 514, 517; passes Re-
 form Bill, 518, 519; 523, 528,
 556.
 Parma, Duke of, 311, 313.
 Parnell, Charles Stewart, 542,
 543.
 Parr, Catherine, wife of Henry
 VIII, 286, 292.
 Parsons, Robert, Jesuit, 306.
 Pascal, Blaise, 379.
 Paterson, William, founds Bank
 of England, 435.
 Paulet, Sir Amyas, 309.
 Paulinus, Suetonius, 22.
 Paulinus, Bishop, 33.
 Peachell, John, 422.
 Peasants, 170, 180, 181; revolt
 in 1381, 187-194.
 Peel, Sir Robert, 516, 523, 525-
 529, 531, 551.
 Pekin, 535.
 Pelham, Henry, 450.
 Pembroke, 116.
 Penda, King, 33.
 Peninsular War, 505-507, 517.
 Penn, William, 396.
 Penn, William (son of preceding),
 422.
 Penny postage, 550-551.
 Penruddock, rising of, 393.
 Penry, John, separatist, 317.
 Penshurst, 257.
 Pentland rising, 430.
 Pentonville Penitentiary, 552.
 People's Charter, 529, 530.
 Perceval, Spencer, 504.
 Percy, Henry (Hotspur), 203.
 Percy, Henry, Earl of Northum-
 berland, 203-205.
 Perrers, Alice, 185, 186.
 Persia, 581, 582.
 Peru, 444.
 Peter the Great, 427.
 Peter the Hermit, 77.
 Peter of Pomfret, 113.
 Peter III, of Russia, 455.
 Peterborough, Dean of, and
 Mary Stuart, 310.
 Petre, Father, 422.
 Pevensey, 57.
 Philadelphia, 464, 466, 469-
 471.
 Philip of Anjou 436

- Philip II, of Spain, 266, 296, 298, 300, 303, 306-308, 311, 314, 419.
- Philip II, of France (Augustus), 110.
- Philip IV, of France (le Bel), 106, 108, 112.
- Philip VI, 176.
- Philippaugh, battle of, 370.
- Philippa, wife of Edward III, 175.
- Philippines, the, 454.
- Phillip, Captain Arthur, 570.
- Picts, 26, 27, 337.
- Pierre des Roches, 116.
- Pilgrimage of Grace, 284.
- Pinkie, battle of, 392.
- Pirates, 149, 253, 254, 318, 486.
- Pitt, William, Earl of Chatham, 452-454, 458, 465, 466, 471, 473, 498.
- Pitt, William (son of preceding), 473, 495, 498-503, 504, 509, 510, 514.
- Pittsburg, 451.
- Pius IV, Pope, 305.
- Pius V, Pope, issues bull against Elizabeth, 305.
- Pizarro, 266.
- Plague. See DISEASE.
- Plan of campaign, 544.
- Plantagenet line, 92, 110, 233.
- Plassey, battle of, 453, 578.
- Plymouth, 313.
- Poitiers, battle of, 179-180, 183.
- Poitou, 116, 118. [244.]
- Poland, 52, 457, 512.
- Pole de la, Chancellor, 194.
- Pole, Henry, Lord Montacute, 289.
- Pole, Michael de la, Chancellor, 194.
- Pole, Reginald, Archbishop of Canterbury, 289, 297, 298.
- Police system, 551.
- "Political Register," 514.
- Pondicherry, 575, 578.
- Pontefract Castle, 179, 230, 231.
- Ponthieu, 181.
- Poor Laws, 329; 481; Amendment Act, 521.
- Pope, Alexander, 491, 492.
- Population, 7, 11, 15-17, 19, 179, 239, 463, 475, 479, 481, 508, 583-584.
- Porchester Castle, 91.
- Port Jackson, 571.
- Portland, Duke of, 504.
- Port Mahon, 444.
- Portsmouth, 355.
- Portugal, 240, 318, 392, 577.
- Pottery industry, 480.
- Poynings, Sir Edward, 287.
- Poynings' Act, 287, 508, 509.
- Præmunire, statute of, 185, 195, 273, 275, 276.
- Prayer Book. See BOOK OF COMMON PRAYER.
- Pre-Raphaelite Brotherhood, 560.
- Presbyterianism, 316, 338-340, 341, 342, 357, 360, 363, 365, 370-376, 398, 405, 407-409, 428-433; Free Church secession from Church of Scotland, 554, 555.
- Preston, battle of, 374, 443.
- Preston Pans, battle of, 450.
- "Pride's Purge," 375, 403.
- Printing, 201, 232, 239, 264, 265.
- Prisons, 484, 488; improved, 552.
- Privy Council, 229, 359, 421, 422, 437, 468.
- Protestantism, 320, 339, 341; 354, 395, 397, 417, 420, 421, 428; in France, 355, 405; in Ireland, 431, 432, 508, 542; in Scotland, 338-340, 430.
- Providence (city), 467.
- Provisors, statute of, 185, 195, 273, 275, 276.
- Prussia, 427, 450, 457; education in, 492; 493, 503.
- Prynne, William, 358.
- Puritanism, 316, 317, 320, 333, 341, 342, 357-359, 366, 367, 380, 381, 385-389, 392, 397, 398, 399, 400, 470, 490, 552.
- Pusey, Edward Bouverie, divine, 553-554.
- Pym, John, 353, 356, 360, 362-368.
- Pyrences, 93, 181.

- Quakers, 399, 409, 410, 422, 466.
 Quebec, 453, 568.
 Quebec Act, 470.
 Queen Anne's Bounty, 437.
 Queensland, 571.
 Querouaille, Louise de, Duchess of Portsmouth, 410.
Quia Emptores, statute, 126.
 Quiberon Bay, battle of, 453.
- Rabelais, 266.
 Radicalism, 461, 462, 530, 544.
 Raeburn, Sir Henry, painter, 492.
 Raikes, Robert, founder of Sunday-schools, 489.
 Raleigh, Sir Walter, 327, 350.
 Ramilies, battle of, 438.
 Ranulph Flambard, Bishop of Durham, 84.
 Raphael, 266.
 Ravenspur, 225.
 Reading, 89.
 Recusancy Act, 343.
 Red Sea, 583.
 Reform Bill, first, **518-519**, 522, 529, 559; second, **537**, 544; third, **539-540**, 555, 559.
 Remonstrance, Grand, 365, 366.
 Renaissance, 201, 324, 329, 330.
 Restoration, English, 404-406.
 Revolution, American. See AMERICAN REVOLUTION.
 Revolution, English. See ENGLISH REVOLUTION.
 Revolution, French. See FRENCH REVOLUTION.
 Revolution, Industrial. See INDUSTRIES.
 Revocation, Act of, 360.
 Reynolds, John, Puritan divine, 342.
 Reynolds, Sir Joshua, painter, 492.
 Rheims, 213.
 Riccall, 55.
 Rich, family of, 282.
 Richard I, 103, **107-109**.
 Richard II, **186-196**; deposed, 197; 202, 205.
 Richard III, 210, **231-233**. See GLOUCESTER, RICHARD, DUKE OF.
- Richard, Duke of York, 201, 216-221.
 Richardson, Samuel, 491.
 Richelieu, Cardinal, 336, 355, 446.
 Richmond, Henry, Earl of, 232. See HENRY VII.
 Richmond, 116.
 Ridley, Nicolas, Bishop of London, 290, 297.
 Ridolfi plots to kill Elizabeth, 305.
 Right, petition of, 355.
 Right, bill of, 428.
 Rights, declaration of, 428.
 Rinuccini, Papal agent in Ireland, 380, 381.
 Rivers, Anthony Woodville, second Earl, 229-231.
 Rivers, Richard Woodville, first Earl, 223.
 Roads, Roman, 25; in thirteenth century, 150-151; in fifteenth century, 250-251, 255, 261; in sixteenth century, 332; in eighteenth century, 475-476.
 Robert of Bellesme, 87.
 Robert, Duke of Normandy, 50, 82-84, 86-88.
 Robert of Mortain, 80.
 Roberts, Frederick, Earl, 575.
 Roberts, pirate, 486.
 Robin Hood, 151, 245.
 Robin of Redesdale, 224.
 Rochelle, siege of, 355.
 Rochester, 405, 425.
 Rochester Bridge, 250, 251.
 Rochester, Lawrence Hyde, Earl of, 421.
 Rockingham, Charles Watson Wentworth, Marquis of, 458, 465, 472.
 Rodney, George Brydges, Lord, Admiral, 472.
 Roebuck, J. A., 562.
 Roger, Bishop of Salisbury, 89, 90.
 Rollo, or Rolf, 46, 47, 50.
 Roman invasion, **21-26**; rule in Britain, 62; 74; calendar 78; architecture, 152.

- Roman Catholics, 317, 343, 344, 365, 370, 380-383, 390, 399, 407, 411; persecutions of, 415, 416; 422, 431, 433, 462, 485, 502, 504, 507-509, 510, 516; relief of, 517, 526. See also CHURCH OF ROME.
- Rome, 18, 26, 39, 52, 80, 189, 272.
- Romilly, Sir Samuel, 551.
- Romney, George, painter, 492.
- Rose, Sir Hugh, 581.
- Rosebery, Archibald Philip Primrose, Earl of, 544.
- Roses, Wars of the, 217-226.
- Rossetti, Dante, Gabriel, 560.
- Rouen, 213.
- Round Barrow Culture, 10.
- "Roundheads," 366.
- Roundway Down, battle of, 368.
- Royal Society, 405.
- Rubens, 337.
- Runnymede, 113.
- Rupert, Prince, 368, 386.
- Ruskin, John, 560.
- Russell, family of, 282.
- Russell, Lord John, afterward Earl, 517, 518, **527-529**, 531, 537, 538.
- Russell, William, Lord, 416, 418, 419.
- Russia, 54, 65, 150, 326, 427, 451, 455, 457, 497, 501, 502, 512, 513, 525, 530; Crimean War, **531-536**; 539, **581-583**.
- Russian Company, 327.
- Ruyter, Dutch admiral, 413.
- Rye House Plot, 418.
- Ryswick, treaty of, 434-436.
- Sabden, 550.
- Sacheverell, Henry, Dr., 439, 440.
- St. Alban's, Monastery, 132; first battle of, 217; second battle of, 220.
- St. Andrews, Castle of, 338.
- St. Bartholomew's Day, massacre of, 305; expulsion of English clergy on, 408.
- St. Bride, 33, 34.
- St. Christopher, 441.
- St. Edmund's Abbey, 283.
- St. Germain's, 432.
- St. Giles (church), Edinburgh, 361.
- St. Helena, 498, 565.
- St. James's Palace, London, 376.
- St. John, Henry, Viscount Boringbroke, 441-443.
- St. Lucia, 507.
- St. Patrick, 33, 74.
- St. Paul's Cathedral, 219, 226, 439, 492.
- St. Swithin, Convent of, 255.
- Saladin, 108.
- Salamanea, battle of, 505.
- Salic law, 175.
- Salisbury, great court at, 91; 393.
- Salisbury, John Montacute, Earl of, 202.
- Salisbury, Earl of. See CECIL, ROBERT.
- Salisbury, Robert Gascoyne-Cecil, third Marquis of, 539, 544, 545, 546.
- Saneroff, William, Archbishop of Canterbury, 423, 433.
- Sanctuary, right of, 146, 147, 229, 245.
- San Domingo, 396.
- San Stefano, treaty of, 536.
- Sandwich, 219.
- Sanitation, 160, 262, 557.
- Santa Cruz, 397.
- Sarah, Duchess of Marlborough, 438, 440.
- Sardinia, 513, 532.
- Sarsfield, Patrick, General, 432.
- Savile, Sir George, 462.
- Savonarola, 201.
- Savoy Conference, 407, 408.
- Savoy, Duke of, 397.
- Savoy Palace, 191.
- Saxe, Marshal, 450.
- Saxons, 26, 27.
- Say and Sele, Lord, 215.
- Schism Act, 441.
- Science in nineteenth century, 556-558.
- Scotland, 5, 13, 14; invaded by William I, 78; Edward I's policy in, **123**; **128-130**, 172,

- 179, 184, 202, 222, 228, 239, 288, 295, 298, 300, 301, 314; revolts against Charles I, **360-362**; 370; Cromwell in, **385-386**; 400, 402; Monk in, **403**; 420; religious struggles, **428-431**; joins England to form United Kingdom, **439**; first Jacobite rising, 443; second Jacobite rising, 450; 476.
- Scotland, Church of, Assembly of, 340, 361, 362. See also PRESBYTERIANISM.
- Scots, 26, 34, 35, 90, 130, 172, 174, 175, 178, 203, 337, 364, 365, 375, 384, 385.
- Scott, Sir Walter, 560.
- Scrope, Richard, Archbishop of York, 204.
- Scrope, Lord, 207.
- Sculpture, 159, 160, 260.
- Scutage, 100.
- Scythia, 54.
- Sea power, 12, 41; Edward I's claim to, 179; English at time of Armada, 312; advanced by Blake, **386-387**; **396-397**; 427, 497; supremacy in, won by Nelson, **501-502**; enables Britain to defeat Continental system, **504**; **505**; makes Britain the sole great Colonial power, 507; 558, 563; insures possession of Australia, **573**; of India, **577-578**, 580, 583.
- Sebastopol, siege of, 533-534.
- Sedgemoor, battle of, 420.
- Self-denying ordinance, 369.
- Senegal, 472.
- Senlac, Hill of, 58.
- Sens, 98.
- "Separatists," 316, 317, 371.
- Septennial Act, 442.
- Settlement, Act of, 383.
- Sevenoaks, battle at, 215.
- Seven Years' War, 427, **451-455**, 463, 493.
- Severus, Emperor, 25.
- Seymour, family of, 282.
- Seymour, Edward, Earl of Hertford, and Duke of Somerset, 289; Protector, **290-292**; 293, 294.
- Seymour, Lady Jane, queen of Henry VIII, 286, 289.
- Seymour, Thomas, Lord, 292.
- Sextus V, Pope, 308, 311.
- Shaftesbury, Anthony Ashley Cooper, first Earl of, 414, 415, 417.
- Shaftesbury, Anthony Ashley Cooper, Lord Ashley and seventh Earl of, 520, 521.
- Shakespeare, William, 205, 213, 266, **325**, 337, 489, 490.
- Sharpe, James, Archbishop of St. Andrews, 430.
- Shelburne, Lord, 472, 473, 502-504.
- Sheldon, Gilbert, Archbishop of Canterbury, 309.
- Shelley, Percy Bysshe, 560.
- Sheriffmuir, battle of, 443.
- Sheriffs, inquest of, 101.
- Shetland Islands, 10.
- "Ship-money," 354, 358, 359, 362, 363.
- Shore, Jane, 230.
- Shrewsbury, 122.
- Shrewsbury, battle of, 203.
- Shrewsbury, Charles Talbot, Earl and Duke of, 442.
- Shrewsbury, George Talbot, sixth Earl of, 309.
- Sicily, 51, 54, 117, 118.
- Sidmouth, Viscount. See ADDINGTON, HENRY.
- Sidney, Sir Philip, 325, 326.
- Sigismund, Emperor, 206.
- Silesia, 450, 451, 455.
- Silk weaving, 480.
- Silures, 21.
- Simmel, Lambert, impostor, 235.
- Simon, Richard, priest, 235.
- Simpson, Sir James Y., 558.
- Sinope, battle at, 532.
- "Six Acts, The," 515.
- Six Articles, Act of, 285, 322.
- Slavery, 23-26, 29, 62, 63, 65, 67, 71; abolished, 520; 553, 575.
- Slave trade, English, 318, 441, 444; abolished, 487.

- Slidell, John, 535.
 Sligo, 314.
 Shuys, battle of, 176, 179.
 Smith, Adam, 480.
 Smithfield, 193, 284.
 Solemn League and Covenant, 371.
 Somers, John, Lord, 440.
 Somerset, Edmund Beaufort, Duke of, 217.
 Somerset, Charles Seymour, Duke of, 442.
 Somerset, Protector. See SEYMOUR, EDWARD.
 Soudan, the, 513, 535-537.
 Soult, Marshal, 505.
 South Africa, 216. 531, 536, 546, 565, **574-576**.
 South African Republic, 546, 575.
 Southampton, 84.
 South Sea Bubble, 444-445.
 Southwark, 60.
 Spain, 26, 27, 30, 179, 181, 202, 238, 239, 307, 308, 311, 313, 314, 318, 347, 349, 354, 363, 386, 392, 395-398, 505, 513.
 Spanish America, 396, 444, 449.
 Spenser, Edmund, 325.
 Spithead, 500, 501.
 Spurs, battle of the, 267, 268.
 Stamford Bridge, battle of, 57, 59.
 Stamp Act, 464-466.
 Standard, battle of the, 90.
 Stanhope, James, Earl, 438, 444, 445.
 Stanley, Sir William, 233, 235.
 Star Chamber, Court of, 236, 324, 354, 355; abolished, 365.
 States-General of France, 497.
 Statute of Gloucester, 125; Marlborough, 120; Mortmain, 125, 195; Merchant's, 126; *Quia Emptores*, 126; Provisors, 185, 195; Premunire, 185, 195, 273, 275, 276; Labourers, 188; Kilkenny, 287; Westminster, first, 124; second, 125.
 Steam-power, 548.
 Steele, Sir Richard, 491.
 Steelyard, the, German Guild, 149.
 Steinkirk, battle of, 434.
 Stephen seizes throne, 89; reign, 90-92.
 Stephenson, George, inventor, 548.
 Stewart, Robert, Viscount Castlereagh, Marquis of Londonderry, 509, 510, 514-516.
 Stigand, Archbishop of Canterbury, 78.
 Stillington, Robert, Bishop of Bath, 229.
 Stony Stratford, 223.
 Stourbridge fair, 150.
 Strafford, Earl of. See WENTWORTH, THOMAS.
 Stratford de Redcliffe, Lord, 532.
 "Strongbow," 102.
 Sudbury, Simon, Archbishop of Canterbury, 93.
 Sueves, 27.
 Suez Canal, 535, 583.
 Suffolk, Charles Brandon, Duke of, 282.
 Suffolk, Henry Grey, Duke of, 296.
 Suffolk, Edmund de la Pole, Earl of, beheaded, 269.
 Suffolk, Michael de la Pole, Earl of, 194.
 Suffolk, William de la Pole, Earl and Duke of, 214, 216.
 Sunday-schools, 489.
 Sunderland, Charles Spencer, third Earl of, 444, 445.
 Supremacy, Act of, 277, 322.
 Surajah Dowlah, 578.
 Surrey, 215.
 Surrey, Henry Howard, Earl of, 289.
 Sussex, 27, 215.
 Sweating sickness. See DISEASE.
 Sweden, 45, 501, 502.
 Sweyn, King of England, 44.
 Sweyn of Denmark, 54, 77.
 Swift, Jonathan, 437, 442, 491, 507.
 Sydney, Algernon, 376, 418.
 Sydney, Australia, 571, 572.
 Syria, 30.

- Table Bay, 574.
 Tacitus, 28.
 Talavera, battle of, 505.
 Talbot, Sir John, 215.
 Talbot, Richard, Earl and Duke of Tyrconnell, 421, 431.
 Tapestry, 57, 159, 330.
 Tasman, Dutch mariner, 569.
 Tasmania, 570, 571, 574.
 Tasso, 266.
 Tattershall Castle, 255.
 Taunton, 420.
 Taxation, 22, 25, 86, 90, 95, 96, 108, 109, 111, 117, 124, 137, 182, 184, 190, 195, 237, 238, 269, 270, 288, 295, 298, 300, 329, 355, 359, 362, 393, 400, 421, 448, 463; in colonies, 464, 465.
 Taylor, Jeremy, 490.
 Temple, the, London, burnt, 191.
 Temple Bar, 484.
 Temple, Richard Grenville, Earl, 454, 459.
 Tenchebrai, battle of, 88.
 Teneriffe, 397.
 Tennyson, Alfred, Lord, 560.
 Test Act, 415, 421; repealed, 517.
 Teutonic invasions, 11, 12, 27; culture, 28; empire, 45.
 Tewkesbury, battle of, 226, 229.
 Thacker, separatist, 317.
 Thackeray, William Makepeace, 561.
 Theobald, Archbishop of Canterbury, 95.
 Theodore, of Tarsus, Archbishop of Canterbury, 35, 69.
 "Thirty-nine Articles," 322, 553, 554.
 Thirty Years' War, 336, 349, 350.
 Thistlewood, Arthur, conspirator, 515.
 Thomas, Duke of Clarence, 204.
 Thomas, Duke of Gloucester, 194, 195.
 Thor, 33.
 Thornbury, 257.
 Thurloe, John, secretary to Cromwell, 392.
 Tillotson, John, Archbishop of Canterbury, 433.
 Tilsit, treaty of, 497, 504.
 Times, The, 549.
 Tithing, 146.
 Titian, 201, 266.
 Tobago, 507.
 Toleration Act, 433.
 Tone, Theobald Wolfe, 509.
 Tonson, Jacob, bookseller, 491.
 Torbay, 424.
 Tories, 417, 419, 434, 436, 439, 440, 441, 443, 471-473, 500, 504; decline of, 516-519; 522-531; transition to Conservatives, 537-538.
 Torres, navigator, 569.
 Torres Vedras, lines of, 505.
 Tostig, Earl of Northumberland, 54-57.
 Touraine, 111.
 Tournay, 235, 268.
 Tower Hill, 193.
 Tower of London. See LONDON.
 Towns, life, 29; unimportant in early England, 65, 106; growth in thirteenth century, 127, 147, 183; increased importance in fifteenth century, 251-256; government of, 255; wealth of, 256; 263, 327; modern predominance of, 563.
 Townshend, Charles, 466-468.
 Townshend, Lord, 478.
 Towton, battle of, 220, 221.
 Tractarian Movement, 553, 554.
 Trade, in early Britain, 12, 19, 23, 25; 45; ruined by English conquest, 62; early slave, 65; 132; wool, 147; growth of, 149-150; 178; restrictions upon, 184, 187, 188; 195, 214, 216, 232; growth of cloth, 238; growth and perils of, in fifteenth century, 251-255; 258, 266, 270, 318, 319; Dutch, 326, 387; expansion in sixteenth century, 326-327; 348, 386, 428, 439, 442, 444, 448, 449, 454, 455, 459,

- 463, 466, 467, 486, 495, 497, 503; growth under Continental system, 504, 506; Irish, 508; corn, 526; free, 527; with China, 531; Indian, 575.
- Trafalgar, battle of, 502, 573, 574.
- Transvaal, the, 575, 576.
- Travel, in thirteenth century, 150-151; in fifteenth, 261; in eighteenth, 476-477.
- Trent affair, 535.
- Trent, Council of, 266, 553.
- Tresham, Francis, 345.
- Tresilian, Sir Robert, 194, 195.
- Trial by battle, 143.
- Trial by jury, 144.
- Triennial Bill, 435.
- Triers, under Cromwell, 399.
- Trincomalee, 472.
- Tromp, Dutch admiral, 387.
- Troyes, treaty of, 208.
- Tull, Jethro, 478.
- Tunis, 396.
- Turenne, Marshal, 397.
- Turgot, economist and minister, 457.
- Turkey, 326, 512, 513; Crimean War, 530-536.
- Turks, 77, 170, 207.
- Turner, J. M. W., painter, 560.
- Tutbury Castle, 308.
- Tyburn, 175, 277, 406, 483.
- Tyler, Wat, rebel, 192, 193.
- Tyndale's Bible, 285.
- Tyrconnell, Duke of. See TALBOT, RICHARD.
- Tyrone, Earl of, 321.
- Ulster, 364, 365, 380; Protestants of, 431.
- Uniformity Act of Elizabeth, 322; of Charles II, 408, 487.
- Unitarians, 433.
- United States, 506, 512, 513, 535, 536, 558, 566, 568, 574, 583.
- Universities, 106; rise of, 165-168; 234, 275, 493; reform of, 554, 559-560; Aberdeen, 560; Birmingham, 560.
- Birmingham, 560; Cambridge, 166, 366, 422, 559, 560; 366, 422, 559, 560; King's College Chapel, 210, 234; St. John's and Christ's Colleges, 234; Emmanuel College, 329; Fitzwilliam Museum, 330; Dublin, 560; Durham, 398, 560; Edinburgh, 560; Glasgow, 560; London, 560; Manchester, 560.
- Oxford, 116, 166-168, 186, 211; Erasmus at, 264; Wolsey at, 268; 324, 325, 366, 398, 559, 560; Magdalen College, 268, 422; Christ's College, 271, 274, 422; New College, 271; University College, 421.
- Royal of Ireland, 560.
- St. Andrews, 560.
- Wales, 560.
- Liverpool, 560.
- Urban II, Pope, 85.
- Urban VIII, Pope, 358, 363.
- Utrecht, Peace of, 427, 441.
- Vacarius, 92.
- Vandals, 18.
- Van Dyck, Sir Anthony, 337, 492.
- Vane, Sir Henry, 393, 406.
- Vasco da Gama, 202, 240.
- Velasquez, 337.
- Venables, Robert, 396.
- Venice, 268.
- Venn, John, divine, 552.
- Vere, Robert de, Duke of Ireland, 194.
- Vernon, Edward, Admiral, 449.
- Versailles, Peace of, 472, 474.
- Vexin, The, 82.
- Victoria, Australia, 571, 572.
- Victoria, Queen and Empress, 321; character and authority, 522-525; wars under, 530-537; domestic reforms in reign of, 537-540; Empress of India, 539; death, 545.
- Vienna, Congress of, 506, 512.
- Vikings, 40, 54.
- Village life, 19; English village communities, 62; conditions

- in English village, 63-65; union in hundreds, 71; 73; in thirteenth century, 142; 176, 179, 250; dwellings in fifteenth century, 258; amusements, 260-261; 263; 327; agriculture of, in eighteenth century, 477-479; effect of industrial revolution on, 481; decline of, in nineteenth century, 563.
- Villeinage, 63, 97, 133; conditions of, 138-141; revolt against, 188-191; disappearance of, 194; 250.
- Villiers, George. See BUCKINGHAM, DUKE OF.
- Vimeiro, battle of, 505.
- Vinci, Leonardo da, 201.
- Virginia, 327, 337, 351, 397, 451, 469.
- Vitalian, 35.
- Vittoria, battle of, 505.
- Voltaire, 427.
- Voltigern, 27.
- Wade, General, 476.
- Wakefield, battle of, 220.
- Wales, 6, 11, 28, 86, 112, 116; conquered by Edward I, 122; title of Prince of, 123; 173, 202, 203, 232; assimilation to English system by Henry VIII, 286.
- Wallace, William, 129.
- Waldensian Church, 391.
- Waller, Sir William, 368.
- Wallingford, 60; treaty of, 104.
- Wallis, a rebel, 225.
- Wall, Roman, 22, 23.
- Walpole, Sir Robert, Earl of Oxford, 444-449, 452, 478, 499.
- Walsingham, Sir Thomas, 302.
- Walter, Hubert, Chancellor, 109, 110, 112.
- Waltham, 52.
- Walworth, William, Lord Mayor of London, 193.
- Wandewash, battle of, 578.
- Warbeck, Perkin, impostor, 235, 236.
- Warham, William, Archbishop of Canterbury, 275.
- Wars of the Roses, 217-226.
- Warwick, Earl of. See DUDLEY, JOHN.
- Warwick, Edward Plantagenet, Earl of, 235; beheaded, 236.
- Warwick, Guy, Earl of, 172, 173.
- Warwick, Richard de Beauchamp, Earl of, tutor of Henry VI, 209.
- Warwick, Richard Neville, Earl of (king-maker), 217, 219-227; 256.
- Warwick, Thomas Beauchamp, Earl of, 195, 196.
- Warrenne, Earl, 125.
- Washington, City of, 506.
- Washington, George, 451, 470, 471.
- Waterford, 102.
- Waterloo, battle of, 507.
- Watt, James, inventor, 480.
- Wearmouth, 64.
- Wedderburn, Alexander, Earl of Rosslyn, 468.
- Wedmore, treaty of, 74.
- Wellesley, Sir Arthur, Duke of Wellington, 493; military career, 505-507; political career, 515-519, 530, 531, 580.
- Wellington, Duke of. See WELLESLEY, ARTHUR.
- Wentworth, Sir Thomas, Earl of Strafford, 359; in Ireland, 360; 362-365, 368, 370, 377, 380.
- Wergeld, 71.
- Wesley, John, 462, 488, 489.
- Wessex, 40-45, 74.
- West, Benjamin, painter, 492.
- West Indies, 383, 396, 454, 455, 465, 472, 565.
- Westminster Abbey, 48, 49, 60, 83, 87, 115, 130, 160, 204, 205, 208, 229, 234, 265, 406.
- Westminster Confession, 371.
- Westminster Hall, 86, 220, 371, 375, 402.
- Westminster, statute of, first, 124; second, 125.
- Westmoreland, Earl of, rebel, 304.

- Wexford, massacre at, 382.
 Weymouth, 216.
 Whigs, 417, 418, 434-444, 447, 452, 458, 460, 471-473, 498, 500, 516-518, 520, 522, 523, 525, **527-529**, 531, 567.
 Whitby, 34; Council of, 74.
 Whitefield, George, 462, 488, 489.
 Whitehall, 376, 379, 388, 392, 400, 402, 406, 422.
 Whitgift, John, Archbishop of Canterbury, 316.
 Wight, Isle of, 27, 373.
 Wilberforce, Archdeacon, 553.
 Wilberforce, William, 487, 520.
 Wild, Jonathan, criminal, 482.
 Wilfrid, Bishop, 34.
 Wilkes, John, case of, 460-462; 514.
 William, Duke of Normandy, 17; childhood, 50; claims English crown, **53-59**; becomes King of England, 60.
 William I (the Conqueror), reign of, **77-83**, 86.
 William II (Rufus), reign, **83-86**, 162.
 William II, German Emperor, 536.
 William III, reign, **428-436**.
 William IV, 481, 487; reign, **518-522**.
 William, Prince, son of Henry I, drowned, 89.
 William of Occam, 168.
 William of Orange, patriot, 307, 308.
 William of Orange, 415, 424; made king, 428. See WILLIAM III.
 William of Wykeham, Bishop of Winchester, 186.
 Willoughby, Sir Hugh, 326.
 Wilson, Richard, painter, 492.
 Wiltshire, James Butler, Earl of, 221.
 Wimbledon, Lord, 354.
 Winchelsea, 179.
 Winchester, 86, 87, 91, 98, 116, 186, 255, 271; school, 559.
 Windsor, 196, 210, 373, 375.
 Witenagemot, 49, 60, 73.
 Wittenberg, 266.
 Woden, 33.
 Wokingham, 62.
 Wolfe, James, 453, 493, 566, 578.
 Wolseley, Sir C., 514.
 Wolsey, Thomas, Cardinal, 223, **268-274**, 279, 302, 333.
 Woodstock, 89.
 Woodville, Anthony, second Earl Rivers, 229-231.
 Woodville, Elizabeth, queen of Edward IV, 223, 228, 230.
 Woodville, Richard, first Earl Rivers, 223.
 Wool trade, 5, 150, 238, 250, 257, 327, 328, 477, 480.
 Worcester, 385, 401.
 Worsley, 476.
 Wren, Sir Christopher, 492.
 Wyatt, Sir Thomas, rebel, 296.
 Wycliffe, John, 170, 185; teaching of, 189, 190, 265.
 York, 23, 33, 55, 56, 220, 363, 458.
 York, Edward Lee, Archbishop of, 282.
 York, Richard, Duke of, 201, **216-220**, 221.
 York, Richard, Duke of, son of Edward IV, 229, 231.
 York House, 333.
 Yorktown, 471.
 Zong, slave-ship, 487.
 Zulus, 575.



Denotes British Possessions

